

convincing evidence which had not been brought out in previous hearings.

With this administrative policy I agree, but I have some question as to its applicability in this case.

Mr. Katzenbach has advised that he is keeping the matter under consideration.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the Record a copy of my letter of April 11, 1962, to Attorney General Robert F. Kennedy.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

APRIL 11, 1962.

The Honorable ROBERT F. KENNEDY,  
U.S. Department of Justice,  
Washington, D.C.

Re: Nicolae Malaxa.

DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: Nicolae Malaxa is a Rumanian alien now residing in New York City. I have received information which leads me to believe that the lawfulness and desirability of his continued presence in this country should be reconsidered.

Malaxa first came to this country in 1946 for a temporary visit as a member of the Rumanian economic delegation. He never returned to Rumania but he later claimed to have become an unwanted capitalist there—despite his appointment to this trade mission and despite the fact that the Communists paid him \$2,500,000 in compensation for factories seized by the Russians and allowed him to transfer his funds to the United States.

In 1948, he began steps to gain permanent residence under the Displaced Persons Act. After hearings, the Immigration Service made a favorable recommendation on his application on September 26, 1951, in an opinion by Mr. A. C. Devaney of the Adjudications Division. Malaxa's self-serving, and at times farfetched, testimony was believed and the contrary testimony of many disinterested persons was rejected in instance after instance. The recommendation failed to receive necessary congressional approval and died. An attempt in Congress to adjust his status by joint resolution was then unsuccessful also.

Malaxa next moved under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952. He was sole owner of Western Tube Corp., which ostensibly planned to build a seamless tubing plant in Whittier, Calif. His corporation filed a petition seeking a first preference quota for Malaxa on the grounds that the corporation urgently needed his services for building the California plant. The petition was approved and Malaxa was admitted from Canada as a permanent resident on September 26, 1953. Western Tube Corp. soon became inactive. It never got beyond the organizational stages and the California plant was not built. Apparently, the only objective which it achieved was to obtain permanent residence in the United States for its owner.

The apparent sham of the Western Tube operation led the Service to attempt to exclude Malaxa when he reentered the country in December 1955, after a stay in Argentina of almost a year. In addition to alleged fraud in the Western Tube application, charges were made involving Malaxa's connections with the Rumanian Iron Guard and the German Nazis prior to and during World War II and dealings with the Communists after World War II.

The special inquiry officer found against Malaxa on all points and ordered him deported. His findings were based partly upon refusals to answer questions asked by the examining officer concerning Malaxa's past Iron Guard, Nazi, and Communist associations. Malaxa contended that an examining officer was not authorized for the hearing and that he could only be required to submit to questioning by the special inquiry officer. The special inquiry officer ruled that Malaxa should answer the examining officer's questions and chose to draw adverse inferences from Malaxa's silence rather than to propound the questions himself. As a result of this procedural dispute, Malaxa's past was not fully explored.

The Board of Immigration Appeals reversed the special inquiry officer in a split decision, holding that the inquiry officer could not draw inferences from Malaxa's silence and that he should have questioned Malaxa instead of relying on the examining officer. The board expressly decided (from a record which was obviously incomplete because of Malaxa's silence) that Malaxa was never affiliated with the Iron Guard, Nazis, or Communists.

Attorney General Rogers then reviewed the case. He agreed with the inquiry officer that Malaxa should have responded to the examining officer's questions and that adverse inferences properly could be drawn from his refusal. Despite this, he affirmed the Board's order admitting Malaxa to permanent residence. Malaxa thus profited from his wrongful refusal to answer questions about his past, because the only consequence was that his past activities were not fully explored for the record. It is hard to see why a final decision was reached favorably to Malaxa on factual issues which he prevented from being fully heard. In the courts, a comparable case would have been remanded for a new hearing in which Malaxa would have responded to questions by the examining officer so that the case could be decided from all relevant evidence.

I realize something can be said for terminating such a case once it is concluded even if the decision was wrong, but new evidence has been revealed which also appears to justify reopening the Malaxa case.

Malaxa has always denied alleged affiliations with the German Nazis, the Rumanian Iron Guard and the Rumanian Communists. There has always been strong evidence against him but I will not attempt to review it here except to mention a few of the incriminating facts concerning his connections with the terrorist Nazi Iron Guard. In

the 1951 proceedings, the testimony of several prominent Rumanians linked Malaxa to the Iron Guard at the time of its January 1941 uprising when it was finally suppressed by General Antonescu. Marion Novotny told of seeing iron guards enter Malaxa's home to obtain arms reportedly stored there for use in the revolt. Alexander Cretzlinu, who was then serving in the Rumanian foreign office, testified that during the uprising General Antonescu told him of learning from his secret service and German officers that Malaxa was the financial backer of the Iron Guard. Max Ausnit, a leading Rumanian industrialist, identified Malaxa as the Iron Guard's financial backer at the time. This and similar testimony was simply denied by Malaxa and his word was accepted, as it apparently again was by the Board of Immigration Appeals and Attorney General Rogers in 1958.

Now it appears that official German war documents published by the State Department in 1960 refute Malaxa's testimony and confirms the testimony against him. At page 1050 of the documents on German foreign policy appears Document 623, a secret telegram dated January 8, 1941, to the German Foreign Ministry from Fabricius, the German Minister in Rumania. Fabricius referred to Malaxa as "Carol's former friend and the present financial mainstay of the Legionnaires." He added that the Legionnaires (Iron Guard) "let this clever big industrialist finance them. He has in his plants the leader of the Legionnaire labor organization, Gana, and there the green flags of Sima flutter everywhere." Of General Antonescu's distrust of Malaxa, Fabricius reported: "The general \* \* \* would like best to send Malaxa and his family off to Germany in order to get rid of them for a while. In reply to a question from him, I told him that, if he wished it, we would be glad to oblige him by taking Malaxa in, since German industry had always been on the best of terms with him. The general considers this his only chance of getting rid of this troublesome schemer."

This telegram is dated only 2 weeks before the Iron Guard revolt which resulted in Malaxa's arrest and imprisonment by Antonescu.

I believe the prior handling of Malaxa's case and the persuasive evidence contained in the German war documents justifies reconsideration. These documents may not meet tests of legal admissibility in judicial proceedings, but a principal reason that the rules of evidence do not apply to immigration matters is that the issues involved are often incapable of such proof. This reason particularly applies in evaluating Malaxa's connection with the Iron Guard which reputedly slaughtered 7,000 Rumanian Jews in 1940-41.

Taken with the other evidence against Malaxa, the German documents appear to be extremely incriminating. I urge you to reconsider the case in this light.

Sincerely yours,

ESTES KEFAUVER,  
U.S. Senator.

## SENATE

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1962

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Bishop W. Earl Ledden, Wesley Theological Seminary, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast sustained our lives to see yet another day which Thou hast made, we look to Thee for wisdom

and strength to do that which is pleasing in Thy sight this day.

As Thy servants in this Chamber confront the massive responsibilities placed upon them by Thy providence and the will of the people, grant that they may have a lively sense of their accountability to Thee, as well as to the people.

Through long and laborious months, Thou hast given them strength for their many and demanding duties. Add Thy blessing, we pray, to all that has been accomplished through their efforts for the good of the Nation and the welfare of all kinds and conditions of men.

Grant that the citizens of this land of liberty may understand that they, themselves, are truly in authority here, each one accountable to Thee for moral integrity, for devotion to justice, and for a decent respect for the opinions of mankind.

May the decisions registered this day beneath the great white dome of this citadel of freedom encourage and empower all responsible men of good will throughout the earth, to the end that righteousness and peace may prevail, and Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven.

In the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 12, 1962, was dispensed with.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore announced that on today, October 13, 1962, he signed the following enrolled bills, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

H.R. 1663. An act for the relief of Dr. Hans J. V. Tiedemann and family;

H.R. 7781. An act to authorize the Administrator of General Services to convey by quitclaim deed a parcel of land in Prince Georges County, Md., to the Silver Hill Voluntary Fire Department and Rescue Squad;

H.R. 8563. An act to amend the Life Insurance Act of the District of Columbia to permit certain policies to be issued to members of duly organized national veterans' organizations;

H.R. 9045. An act to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended;

H.R. 9669. An act for the relief of Molly Kwauk;

H.R. 12135. An act to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1964 and 1965 for the construction of certain highways in accordance with title 23 of the United States Code, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12217. An act for the relief of George Edward Leonard;

H.R. 12434. An act to facilitate the work of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 12708. An act to increase the jurisdiction of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia in civil actions, to change the names of the court, and for other purposes.

## LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the morning hour were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

## RESOLUTIONS

## ORIGINATION OF BILLS APPROPRIATING MONEY FOR SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted a resolution (S. Res. 414) asserting the power of the Senate to originate bills appropriating money for the support of the Government, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

## RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DISCOVER NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. TALMADGE) submitted a resolution (S. Res. 415) favoring a program of research to discover new uses for agricultural products, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, which appears under a separate heading.)

## APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT CONCERNING THE PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT OF THE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 416) appointing a committee to notify the President concerning the proposed adjournment of the session, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appears under a separate heading.)

## THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 417) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the Vice President for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

## THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 418) tendering the thanks of the Senate to the President pro tempore for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over the deliberations of the Senate, which was considered and agreed to.

## APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 419) authorizing the President of the Senate to make certain appointments after the sine die adjournment of the Congress, which was considered and agreed to.

(See the above resolutions printed in full when submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD, which appear under separate headings.)

## MILWAUKEE JOURNAL DEPLORES FLAGRANT LOGROLLING IN GLEN ELDER PROJECT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, 2 weeks ago, I spoke at some length against a reclamation project in Kansas that would eventually cost \$60 million. This project was not only unjustified on every score, but I received petitions from 90 percent of the farmers who allegedly would benefit from the project; they vehemently oppose it.

The Milwaukee Journal has summed up the arguments against this waste in an editorial entitled "Some More 'Logrolling,'" and has done so in what I regard as an extremely effective and persuasive way. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## SOME MORE LOGROLLING

Senator PROXMIRE, Democrat, of Wisconsin, lost his fight against a \$750,000 appropriation for preliminary work on the \$60 million Glen Elder Dam and irrigation project in Kansas. His one-man filibuster was ignored and the Senate voted, 57 to 17, to leave the

item in the \$5.2 billion emergency public works bill which was later passed.

Perhaps his effort to draw attention to what he called fantastic waste in Federal irrigation and flood control projects was not all wasted, however. He made a powerful case.

The Glen Elder project was first authorized by a single line in a 1944 bill that listed 325 other projects. It was to cost only \$17 million.

Examined in light of today's situation a \$60 million outlay makes almost no sense. Water would be provided for 60 new farms, but 80 or more farms would be flooded out. Cost per acre of the irrigated land would be around \$1,800, of which owners would pay back only \$191 an acre.

One of the main benefits expected is in increased feed grain production on 13,000 of 21,000 acres to be irrigated. And the Federal Government is frantically trying to reduce the feed grain surplus. Some 90 percent of farmers involved are said to oppose the Glen Elder development.

The dam would provide a municipal water supply for the little city of Beloit, Kans. (population 3,800). At the same time it would so reduce streamflow that health authorities at Topeka, Kans. (population 120,000), are worried about pollution and a supply of enough clean water to meet domestic and industrial requirements there.

With all this evidence before them, why didn't the Senators take heed? If the \$750,000 appropriation wasn't enough to arouse their concern, why weren't they moved to hold up starting a project that has so little justification? Why did only 17 seem to share Senator PROXMIRE's dismay over colossal waste on western water projects?

Surely it wasn't because more than half the Senate thought Senator PROXMIRE was wrong. Most of them knew he was right. The explanation unquestionably is found in congressional "log rolling."

Many of the votes for Glen Elder were cast by Senators who expected, in return, to win support for other Federal projects in their own States—some, no doubt, just as questionable. As the U.S. News & World Report said recently, "Candidates for the Senate and House seek votes on the basis of what they have done and can do for the home folks. It is from Washington that more and more of the good things of life seem to flow. Politicians tend to be rated on their success or lack of success in getting a share of these good things."

In the case of Glen Elder Dam, it is indeed doubtful that it deserves to be rated as good.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## KIM CHUNG SHIN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1969, House bill 11866.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 11866) for the relief of Kim Chung Shin (Mary Rathbun).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.



The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, no action is contemplated on this bill. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further proceedings under the quorum call may be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. BUSH:

Address delivered by Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER to the Republican State Convention, Hartford, Conn., June 4, 1962.

#### TRIBUTE TO SENATOR OREN E. LONG, OF HAWAII

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before this session closes I wish to pay a short tribute to my friend from Hawaii, Senator OREN LONG, who has elected not to return for another session.

During my service in the Senate I do not know of any Senator who has more favorably impressed his colleagues in the Senate in the years he has served than has the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. LONG]. I did not serve on a committee with him, but I was associated with him in several ways, and I was impressed by his fine principles of character and honor that never faltered or failed, but were the basic and controlling factors in all his relations with his fellow Senators, as well as on public questions.

He is a man of fine intelligence, quick to perceive. He has an innate modesty which is personally attractive. Moreover, he is always a great humanitarian in his approach to various problems and in making his decisions.

He is also a man of great spiritual capacity and appreciates greatly the spiritual values not merely in a theoretical way, but in a practical manner in his everyday living.

These are his controlling factors in regard to conclusions and decisions and official acts as a Senator. He has made a distinct contribution in the Senate, which is a climax to a distinguished career as an educator and in other avenues of public service. I know he has made a contribution to the Nation and to the Senate.

I for one will be sorry to see him go, and I wish for him unbounded satisfaction of life that will continue throughout rich years which will bring him fine reward.

#### OREGON AREA REDEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, among the many steps taken by the administra-

tion to restimulate the economy of our Nation was one which led to the creation of the Area Redevelopment Administration, which functions under the Department of Commerce. Much interest in the program and the projects being undertaken through the authorities entrusted to that agency, has been voiced to me by Oregonians in every corner of the State.

As a result of this expression of interest, I requested from the Area Redevelopment Administration a status report upon each of the ARA projects which involve my State. I have just received this report and because of its interest to Oregon, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### Oregon summary sheet

Population:	
1962 estimate	-----
1960 census	1,768,687
Total number of counties	36
Designated counties:	
Areas	8
Population	164,185
Indian reservations	1
Projects authorized (1):	
Total cost	\$1,306,500
ARA funds requested	\$812,000
Pending project proposals (5):	
Total cost	\$2,142,368
ARA funds requested	\$1,428,973
Projects being planned for filing:	
Total cost (estimate)	\$8,049,400
ARA funds requested (estimate)	\$5,064,060
New jobs created (estimate)	792
Technical training programs:	
Proposed and pending	6
Overall economic development programs (OEDP)	
Approved (6):	
Counties	5
Indian reservations	1

##### Overall economic development program approved

##### CLATSOP COUNTY 5(b) 5 AREA

Projects being planned for submission to ARA:

1. Port of Astoria—Grant to rehabilitate dock facilities and add loft crane and trackage:	
Section 8 grant:	
Total cost	\$3,800,000
ARA funds requested	\$2,200,000
New jobs created	Will save 170 jobs
Status: Application being revised.	
2. Port of Astoria—to rehabilitate small boat basin:	
Section 7 loan:	
Total cost	\$150,000
ARA funds requested	\$15,000
New jobs created	Not determined
Status: Under study and discussion.	
3. Convention center—To construct and equip a convention center at Seaside, Oregon:	
Section 7 loan:	
Total cost	\$700,000
ARA funds requested	\$700,000
Status: Under study and discussion.	
4. Expansion and addition to a sawmill:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$180,000
ARA funds requested	\$117,000
New jobs created	30
Status: Being developed.	

##### Overall economic development program approved—Continued

##### COLUMBIA COUNTY 5(b) 5 AREA

Projects being planned: Construction of a steel mill using local low-grade iron ore and deep water site on the Columbia. This project will largely depend on the outcome of a feasibility study which will be requested soon. (None approved.)

##### JOSEPHINE COUNTY 5(b) 5 AREA

1. Josephine Plywood Corp.—West Coast Plywood Co. (formerly). Purchase and modernization of a layup plant and green veneer plant:	
Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$1,306,500
ARA funds requested	\$812,000
New jobs created	250

Projects pending:

1. Manufacturing project—To expand existing business:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$109,700
ARA funds requested	\$71,305
New jobs created	83

Status: Awaiting additional information.

Projects being planned:

1. Electronic manufacturing:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$177,000
ARA fund requested	\$155,000
New jobs created	77

Status: Expect to submit application in January 1963.

2. Warehousing and box manufacturing:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$90,000
ARA funds requested	\$41,000
New jobs created	16

Status: Preparing information.

3. A hardwood plant:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$262,400
ARA funds requested	\$170,560
New jobs created	40

Status: Application being prepared.

4. A plywood plant:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$140,000
ARA funds requested	\$91,000
New jobs created	No estimate

Status: Application being prepared.

##### LINCOLN COUNTY 5(b) 3 AND 5

Projects pending:

1. A hardwood manufacturing plant:

Section 6 loan:	
Total cost	\$190,000
ARA funds requested	\$65,000
New jobs created	15

Status: A revised application is being submitted.

2. Newport Commission—Construction of adequate port facilities:

Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:	
Total cost	\$171,018
ARA funds requested	\$171,018

Status: Sent to Community Facilities Administration for processing.

3. Oregon State University—Development of an Oceanography Laboratory at Newport:

Section 8 grant:	
Total cost	\$1,286,650
ARA funds requested	\$921,650

Status: Sent to Community Facilities Administration for processing.

### Overall economic development program approved—Continued

#### Projects being planned:

##### 1. Resort and marina:

###### Section 6 loan:

Total cost.....	\$750,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$487,000
New jobs created.....	100

Status: Information being prepared.

##### 2. City of Newport sewage disposal system—Improvement and expansion:

###### Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:

Total cost.....	\$575,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$432,000

##### 3. City of Newport water system—Improvement and expansion:

###### Sections 7 and 8 loan and grant:

Total cost.....	\$200,000 to \$700,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$200,000 up

Status: Sewage and water project — Consultation made by the city of Newport to study and prepare economic justification for the Area Redevelopment Administration in city and surrounding areas including oceanography laboratory—Eventide, agate beach development, industrial park, etc.

#### HOOD RIVER COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

#### Projects pending:

##### 1. Port of Hood River—Construction of industrial site:

###### Section 6 loan:

Total cost.....	\$385,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$200,000
New jobs created.....	20

Status: Sent to the Small Business Administration for processing.

Projects being planned: A group is actively working on a project proposal for the development of a ski area development.

#### WASCO AND SHERMAN COUNTIES 5(b)5 AREA

#### Projects being planned:

##### 1. Wood products plant (Wasco County):

###### Section 6 loan:

Total cost.....	\$200,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$130,000
New jobs created.....	80

Status: Application material to be prepared.

##### 2. Manufacturing company—Expansion (Wasco):

###### Section 6 loan:

Total cost.....	\$25,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$15,000
New jobs created.....	9

#### YAMHILL COUNTY 5(b)5 AREA

Organizational underway, with some work completed on provisional OEDP. (None approved.)

#### WARM SPRINGS INDIAN RESERVATION

#### Projects being planned:

##### 1. Development of the Kahnuta Hot Springs resort:

###### Section 6 loan:

Total cost.....	\$1,350,000
ARA funds requested.....	\$85,000
New jobs created.....	75

Status: Feasibility study being done with ARA grant. This project if approved, will necessitate a training program for guides for pack and riding trips.

### MISCELLANEOUS TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REQUESTS INVOLVING OREGON AND PACIFIC NORTHWEST

1. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: A study of the needs of fishery cooperation in the Pacific Northwest, \$25,000 (under review).

2. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries: A study of the Pacific Northwest Trawl Fishery, \$60,000 (under review).

3. Oregon Department of Planning and Development: Evaluation of existing and proposed small craft harbors along the Oregon coast and navigable river, \$60,000 (under review).

4. Bureau of Indian Affairs: Primarily a resort development study for the Warm Springs Indian Reservation, \$10,000 (grant approved).

5. Oregon Department of Planning and Development: A study of Oregon hardwoods, \$50,990 (under review).

6. Livestock company: Automated feedlot study, \$8,500 (approved).

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I feel sure that in the months ahead many projects which are now under study will materialize into jobs and payrolls for Oregonians in the designated counties. I assure the ARA that I shall do everything in my power to assist the program personnel in their job of translating the President's ideals into living reality.

### AMA READIES BIG POLITICAL DRIVE

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in yesterday morning's Washington Post and Times-Herald there was published a very interesting column written by Drew Pearson entitled "AMA Readies Big Political Drive." The article points out what the American Medical Association purportedly is planning to do by way of its political blitzkrieg in the closing days of the campaign. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AMA READIES BIG POLITICAL DRIVE (By Drew Pearson)

Many doctors, busy caring for people's health, don't know that their trade union has now prepared one of the most elaborate and careful political campaigns in recent years.

That union, the American Medical Association and its subsidiaries, has drafted letters to be signed by thousands of doctors and nurses and sent out just a few days before election day against Congressmen who lean toward medical-care assistance for the elderly. The letters will brand the Congressmen as favoring socialism.

This letter-writing strategy has been kept very hush-hush, and the following instructions have been sent with the letters: "The doctors and their nurses are not to release one single copy of this letter in order to prevent the opposition from obtaining a copy."

However, this column has obtained a complete set of both the letter and the instructions for mailing it. Though the letter is not supposed to be mailed until Nov. 3 or 5, it may be a good idea to let the voting public know in advance what the doctors' trade union is up to.

One letter in the doctors' barrage pins the socialism label on Representative WALTER MOELLER, a middle-of-the-road Democrat, of Lancaster, Ohio, who has not even taken a

formal stand either for or against medicare, though he has indicated that some means should be found to help older people with their medical bills.

#### DOCTORS' TARGET

MOELLER is a modest, moderate, hard-working Congressman.

But here is the instruction which the AMA has sent out to doctors and nurses in MOELLER's 10th Ohio District:

"1. Secretaries and doctors should address their envelopes and sign the letters now and hold them for mailing until the week before election.

"2. Each doctor should personally underline Mr. Abele's name with ink before signing. (This refers to Homer E. Abele, the Republican candidate against Representative MOELLER.)

"3. Add a postscript in ink to make the letter more personal.

"4. Mr. MOELLER's name has been removed from the letter and if any name is to be used in the postscript, it should be Mr. Abele's spelled out. If the doctor wishes to say something about MOELLER he should use the words 'the present Congressman.' The frequency of name repetition, whether good or bad, is impressed upon the mind and the name remembered most is apt to be voted for.

"5. The doctors and their nurses are not to release one single copy of this letter in order to prevent the opposition obtaining a copy.

"6. Letters should not be mailed until Thursday, November 1, so as to reach the individual on Saturday or Monday, November 3 or 5.

"7. A categorical list of Mr. MOELLER's voting record will be available for each doctor to use in his postscript comments."

#### HOW TO VOTE

Enclosed with these careful instructions to each doctor is the following letter branding Representative MOELLER as an enemy of private enterprise and an advocate of socialism.

At the top of the letter is marked in three places "copy." Then follows this further instruction:

"This is a copy of a letter which is to be circulated in Fairfield County, Ohio, and, perhaps, also in other counties of the 10th Congressional District. It is to go out over the signature of a physician."

The letter itself, to be copied by the doctor on his own stationery and mailed just as the voters are about to go to the polls and too late for the Congressman to answer, reads:

"Dear \_\_\_\_\_: As a physician I am happy to participate in the campaign against polio and help other community activities which promote your welfare. Current governmental policies necessitate physicians' participation also in politics.

"I do not object to a man as a Republican or a Democrat, but I do object to any public official with liberal socialistic ideas that promote governmental control of your life and mine.

"I believe sincerely that the present Congressman is a liberal with socialistic tendencies, who is trying to destroy private enterprise, our freedom and our security.

"Vote for Homer E. Abele, a conservative candidate, to help stop the spread of socialism and to preserve our freedom. Sincerely."

Note: One thing the drafters didn't figure on was the risk of libel for the doctors signing these letters. Though the courts have not taken as clear cut a position on branding a man a Socialist as they have on branding him a Communist, the two are so closely allied in some people's minds that the courts are beginning to get tougher with this type of name calling. To call a man a Communist is libel per se.



Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the AMA politicians are not going to fool the American people in this campaign, for the American people recognize that medical care for the aged is a moral obligation and the responsibility of all the people of this country, acting through their Government.

Apparently the AMA is oblivious to the fact that many thousands of young people—particularly young married couples—are beginning to recognize the great social, economic, and medical problem which has arisen in this country. It has arisen because of the failure of the United States to provide care for our elderly citizens comparable to the care for the elderly provided in other free nations of the world. The Scandinavian countries, for example, put us to shame when programs of medical care for our people are compared.

I am preparing a speech which summarizes the position the senior Senator from Oregon has taken on medical issues during many years in the Senate. I had hoped I might have had it finished by today. Much of the time I planned to devote to this in the past week, however, has been necessarily taken up in giving careful consideration to a good many other economic issues which involve the welfare of the people of my State.

I thus have had to postpone completion of my speech on medical problems. I intend to set forth my reasons for complete support of President Kennedy's medical care program for the aged, which would provide for medical care on a sound principle under social security. I am sure the voters of my State would like to have for ready reference a summary of my views in support of President Kennedy's medical care program.

It is my understanding that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will be kept open for some days after Congress adjourns sine die—when it does—and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the speech I am preparing on medical care, giving my reasons for supporting unequivocally the President's program—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. I ask that my speech be printed in an issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to be published after adjournment. It is my understanding that usually there is a period of 10 days to 2 weeks in which to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD material that we are unable to have ready on adjournment day. Am I correct in that understanding?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, if some other Senator wishes the floor, I yield. There is another morning hour subject upon which I wish to speak.

#### THE RUNAWAY WAGON OF THE NEW FRONTIER

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, this is my 16th year as a Member of the U.S. Senate. During that

period I have served with some of the country's most respected men and under some of the Senate's most able leaders; however, for the past 2 years I have had the privilege of serving with a majority leader who stands second to none.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is one of the ablest, most dedicated, fairest, and most respected men who have held that position, and it has been a privilege to work with him in his official capacity.

This point should be emphasized as we discuss the present dilemma in which the Congress now finds itself.

But let us face it—the administration is in trouble. Last year they obtained control of the Congress and got it started, but they do not know how to stop it. A small group of prima donnas in an open revolt against the Senate leaders have grabbed the bit in their teeth and are running away with the frontier wagon, scattering the administration's legislative plans all over the New Frontier. Someone has got to come to their rescue.

My patience has ended. I am thoroughly disgusted—and I am sure I am not alone in that sentiment—at the disgraceful spectacle of a Congress stalling along, unable to reach an adjournment.

Now we are told that an agreement cannot be reached on some public works projects, or on what is better described as the "pork barrel." Some congressional Members under threats of filibusters, others through special deals, threats of quorum calls, or delays of adjournment are attempting to bludgeon the Congress into accepting their pet multi-million-dollar projects—projects many of which have never been approved, some of which have never been authorized, and certainly in many instances projects which cannot be justified.

This public works bill presently in dispute was delayed for consideration by the Congress until the closing days of the session with the strong suspicion that by so delaying, it was figured the Members in their anxiety to go home would accept anything. The absence of a quorum makes it easy for one to carry out a threat, should his pet project be eliminated.

I am of the opinion that with less than 3 months to go before the new Congress convenes it would be better to adjourn sine die without approving any bill at all. Certainly as a new Congress convenes next January it could more intelligently reappraise the merits of the respective projects.

However, if the Congress wishes to stay here a few more days or weeks or until January to debate these issues I, as one Member of the Senate, will cooperate and rearrange my plans to be present.

To avoid any misunderstanding or possible embarrassment either to the leadership or to the administration, however, I am suggesting now that, should it be decided to continue the Congress over into next week, they would be well advised to take appropriate steps in advance to notify the Members of the Senate that a quorum will be expected to be present prior to the consideration of any business on each day that Congress re-

mains in session after midnight October 13, 1962.

As long as the Senate or the House tries to act without a quorum it is at the mercy of any individual Member.

I understand that today there are fewer than 25 Senators in Washington.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "Crisis of Congress," by Roscoe Drummond, published in today's issue of the Washington Post, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### CRISIS OF CONGRESS

(By Roscoe Drummond)

The greatest national need today is not to get a man on the moon nor to build an aquarium in the District of Columbia.

These things are all right and they are going to be done. But I submit that the frantic scramble of Congress to pass vital bills and appropriate vast sums of money in the last weary, out-of-breath hours of the tail end of the session reveals that the greatest need today is not for Congress to do something about others but to do something about itself.

Congress is perilously near to losing its capacity to transact the public business.

It has already lost the capacity to transact the public business carefully, responsibly, and efficiently.

Congress is losing power. It is losing prestige. It risks losing the confidence of the country.

This isn't just bad for Congress. It is bad for the country. It means that our very system of government—a government of balanced and coequal powers—is being altered by default.

With all the earnestness and conviction of a death-bed confession, Republican Senate floor leader Kenneth Wherry of Nebraska shortly before his passing some 10 years ago, pleaded with his colleagues in these words:

"The creaking machinery of Congress is so appallingly inadequate for modern times that free representative government is endangered."

But Congress has been too busy to attend to itself.

It not only has not given "continuous attention" to the problem. It has not given it any attention—in 16 years.

Since then a few things have happened—like the cold war, \$90 billion budgets, an exploding population, the race into outer space, a Soviet satellite state planted in the Western Hemisphere—which make the careful, responsible, efficient transaction of the public business by Congress a matter of national survival.

Congress simply isn't doing its job. It is doing it less well every year. This can't go on much longer.

Fortunately, two of the most influential Members of the House—Representatives THOMAS B. CURTIS, of Missouri, and CHET HOLIFIELD, of California—have been working on a bipartisan project which can lead to wide-ranging reorganization of congressional procedures, practices, and rules. They have already identified many of the areas crying for reform.

Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Democrat, of Pennsylvania has sponsored a resolution with bipartisan backers in both Houses to create a Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress. There is obviously gathering support for some kind of congressional reorganization.

Congress should certainly pick the scholars to do this study, but it seems to be that at least a half dozen of the big foundations would want to volunteer to contribute the funds to make it possible.

# FEED GRAIN PROBLEM IN PACIFIC NORTHWEST

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, since the first of August, the congressional delegations from the Pacific Northwest have been actively, and continually, urging the Department of Agriculture to explore and, on the basis of the facts which we believe substantiate the position of Northwest agriculture, to modify present departmental policies with respect to the feed grains.

It is our contention that our area is not a feed-grain deficit area. We believe that this contention is well sustained by careful studies made by the economists at Oregon State and Washington State universities.

We further believe that the adverse price differential situation with respect to corn produced in the Middle West is, in part, the responsibility of the Federal Government, since the figures clearly show the differential has been seriously aggravated by Government programs and policies respecting agriculture.

I have today received from Mr. James Hill, chairman of the Pacific Northwest Feed & Livestock Council, a copy of a letter dated October 10, addressed to Secretary Freeman, which clearly, succinctly, and in my judgment irrefutably sets forth the case for our livestock, turkey, and poultry producers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I have referred, together with the attachments thereto, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OCTOBER 10, 1962.

HON. ORVILLE L. FREEMAN,  
Secretary of Agriculture, Department of Agriculture,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I enjoyed the opportunity to visit with you in Portland last week and to discuss the seriousness of grain price relationships to our Pacific Northwest livestock feeding industry.

We have enclosed a copy of the Marion Thomas letter with figures, and comments on the chart you gave me charting "average farm price differentials between Nebraska corn and Oregon barley by months for 1950-54, 1955-59, 1960, 1961, and through June 1962."

We are of the opinion that your chart and our information shows and substantiates the following:

(a) 1950-54 PNW feed grain, barley, was within a livable economic price spread as compared to Nebraska corn. During this period our feeders had 4 to 5 months each crop year to cover feed needs at prices not to exceed \$3 per ton over Nebraska corn. Even at the worst periods of the crop year (PNW barley advancing—Nebraska corn declining) our spread did not exceed \$9 per ton. Major feeders covered season's needs when the spread was 0 to \$3.

(b) 1955-59 PNW barley prices began to reflect larger spreads after grain production adjustment and Public Law 480 programs began to operate. But even during this period our feeders would have 2 to 3 months each crop year when they could cover their year's feed barley needs at less than \$6 per ton spread over Nebraska corn.

(c) In the last few months of 1960 spreads between PNW barley and Nebraska corn advanced to as high as \$18 per ton. Since that time these spreads have been against

our livestock economy by \$10 to \$16 a ton consistently. Even at harvesttime our feeders have not been able to cover feed needs at less than \$10 adverse spread. Our livestock feeders, especially hog, broiler, and turkey industries cannot long continue under these adverse feed grain price relationships which have now been with us 2 years.

This condition, although not solely created by your administration, has been accentuated and prolonged by administrative actions under the emergency feed grain legislation of 1961-62. Unless corrective action is soon taken, we fear these conditions could actually be perpetuated.

In the fall of 1961 your department partially recognized the inequity of our livestock feeders position and instituted a temporary milo release program. Although spreads for the first 6 months of 1962 are in the highest in over 20 years, we have not had any indication of current corrective action. Thus we become greatly concerned when we read in the October 8, 1962, Wall Street Journal that—

"The Agriculture Department announced it will begin selling Government-owned corn at market prices, but not below levels which prevailed generally at harvesttime in 1960 and 1961. The Government already is selling grain sorghums under the same formula. From July 1 to September 28, 44 million bushels of sorghums were sold."

Here again this indicated sell-back target period of 1960 and 1961 represents a period when our PNW prices (non-sell-back area) were at most substantial difference above Midwest prices (sell-back area). Our feeders cannot continue such adverse competitive costs for their feed grains and must not be frozen into this uneconomic position any longer.

Therefore, we respectfully refer you to our well documented "Action Memorandum" of August 1, 1962, supported by studies of Oregon State University and Washington State University and presented personally to you by a group from our congressional delegation.

The vital significance and uncertainty of Government action make it most difficult for our people to decide wisely about future use of their resources. Time is of the essence. Therefore, we urge Government action now to reasonably correct this inequitable position.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, JR.,  
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed  
Grain & Livestock Council.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN  
AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,  
State of Oregon, October 6, 1962.

Mr. JAMES HILL, JR.,  
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed Grain &  
Livestock Council, Pendleton, Ore.

DEAR JIM: We are enclosing herewith the chart showing farm price differentials between Nebraska corn and Oregon barley, which Secretary Freeman gave you earlier this week.

As requested, we have checked the chart and find that through May 1962 it is essentially in agreement with published USDA mid-month farm price data, after the indicated calculations have been made.

Starting with June 1962, the lines on the chart depart significantly from published USDA data. We find that the differential in June 1962 was \$14.78 a ton instead of the \$13 to \$13.50. Likewise, the differential in July, \$11.79 instead of approximately \$10 shown. In August the difference was \$11.47 instead of \$9. The correct points for the 3 months are shown in red on the chart.

Incidentally, we find the chart shows the August 1960 differential about \$1 higher than it actually was. In other words, the differential in August 1960 was only 15 cents higher

than in 1961, according to our calculations shown in the attached tables.

While we believe there are better measures of the price differentials, in summary we would say that the chart, when corrected, shows the situation as you have been describing it; that is, differentials between Northwest barley prices and Midwest feed grain prices started increasing significantly in the 1955-59 period after grain production and adjustments and Public Law 480 programs began to operate. These spreads reached new highs in 1962 and remained above all other years charted at least until mid-August.

I hope this will help you eliminate doubts about the situation and obtain action that will substantially reduce this obstacle to continued economic development of the area.

Very truly yours,

MARION D. THOMAS,  
Extension Agricultural Economist.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST FEED, GRAIN &  
LIVESTOCK COUNCIL,  
Pendleton, Ore.  
To All Council Members, Associates, Pacific  
Northwest Congressional Delegations:

On August 2, 1962, council representatives with a group of our Senators and Congressmen personally presented our action memorandum to Secretary Freeman. This memorandum extremely well supported and documented by Oregon State University and Washington State University studies pointed out the following highlights:

(a) Administration of Federal feed grain programs has developed distorted feed grain price relationships which will force Pacific Northwest livestock and poultry producers out of business unless these disadvantages are corrected.

(b) Our livestock and poultry people have been paying \$12 to \$16 per ton more for their feed grains than feeders in other major grain producing areas of the Nation.

(c) This is the greatest disadvantage for the Pacific Northwest livestock industry in 25 years. Though unintentional, the effect of Government action has been to benefit livestock feeders, related industries, and the people of other areas at the expense of like interests in the Pacific Northwest.

(d) Recent developments indicate that a feed-grain-cost squeeze on Pacific Northwest livestock feeders and poultrymen is going to remain severe in the 1962-63 feeding period unless administrative action is taken to restore reasonable patterns and price relationships.

Our action memorandum requested that immediate action be taken to establish and implement policies which will restore reasonable and equitable feed grain price relationships to the Pacific Northwest.

We recommended that for the short-term immediate (until the new form legislation could get our area back into balance) that the Secretary ship CCC-owned milo, corn or both to the Pacific Northwest and sell them into our markets at the same percentage below support levels in the Midwest. In other words, apply his sell-back program equally and fairly in all major grain producing market structures.

We also pointed out that a fair price relationship from our studies would be no more than \$3 per ton higher price for Portland, Ore., feed grain as compared to Kansas City feed grain.

Since August 2, the Secretary and his staff have been considering our case. We hardly expected an answer during the heat of the Billie Sol Estes case and the strains of getting farm legislation through this Congress. Now those hurdles are passed and we are getting down to the wire.

The Department economists have taken issue as to whether we are actually a feed grain surplus producing area. The point is, the Department should not make sell back



prices available in every feed deficit area and should not be put in the position of making postage stamp rates for feed grains all over the Nation. Of course, the plain simple fact is that the Pacific Northwest is a grain surplus producing area. Over 70 percent of the grains we produce are dependent solely on an export market or Government storage.

We can thank Orville Freeman and the administration for battling through our farm legislation which for the first time officially recognizes wheat as a part of the total feed grain picture. Proper administration of this new legislation can ultimately solve our economic problem of feed grain price relationships.

But, "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch" we are temporarily frozen and locked into a most uneconomic position—unless the Secretary takes short-term emergency action to free us.

Actions to be taken: It is important that each of us continue our educational work with our friends, organizations, and with the city business leaders. When the big city businessman, banker, or industrialist finds out what adverse feed grain price relationships are doing to the economy of this Pacific Northwest he gets interested (see pp. 5, 6, and 7, "Meanwhile Back at the Ranch"). Keep in touch with your Congressman and Senator. Let them know the facts as they affect you—as you see them—do not forget Secretary Freeman.

Budget: Most of you responded quickly to our first request. Our sincere thanks. If you haven't acted, please let us hear from you one way or "tother."

Organizational meetings: It is the time of year when all of our commodity and livestock groups start holding annual meetings. It is very important that each group be aware of our program. Wherever possible it is important to have the delegate body pass a resolution favoring (1) participating in the council affairs and (2) authorizing the officers to support the council program so long as there is no direct conflict with the organization's policy.

Once again your directors deeply appreciate the very fine response from our membership and our associations. Our university people at Oregon State University and Washington State University have been indispensable.

Sincerely,

JAMES HILL, Jr.,  
Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council.

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,  
Pendleton, Ore., October 1, 1962.

Mr. JAMES HILL, Jr.,  
Chairman, Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council, Pendleton, Ore.

DEAR JIM: Attached is a check for \$100, authorized by the Oregon Wheat Commission on September 25, to help defray the expenses of the council.

The commission also endorsed the activities of the council and restated its own policy of urging the USDA to correct present regional feed grain price relationships.

During the past 4 years the commission has contributed over \$12,000 in ways calculated to enhance the growth of livestock feeding in Oregon, believing that the Pacific Northwest should produce grain for Pacific Northwest livestock and poultry to supply Pacific Northwest markets for meat. As you know, Oregon wheat growers have long advocated a two-price system for wheat as the most practical way to accomplish this.

Under the 1963 wheat program a version of the two-price plan will be the subject of a grower referendum for the wheat program in 1964. We hope the Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council will join Oregon wheat growers in their efforts to get an acceptable, workable certificate

plan, including the substitution clause allowing wheat to be grown on feed grain acres at prices or supports competitive with coarse grains.

Sincerely yours,

OREGON WHEAT COMMISSION,  
By WINN TUTTLE, Administrator.

"MEANWHILE BACK AT THE RANCH," A TALK ON AGRICULTURE BY JAMES HILL, JR., BEFORE THE CITY CLUB OF PORTLAND, OREG., SEPTEMBER 28, 1962

Agriculture is of major importance to our Nation, to its people, to you. To accentuate this statement let's take a quick look at USDA leaflet No. 491—"Background on Our Nation's Agriculture"—it is the yellow folder—and follow me while I quote portions.

What is modern farming? Modern farming is the Nation's biggest industry. Farming employs 7.1 million workers—more than the combined employment in transportation, public utilities, the steel industry, and the automobile industry. Pretty good so far.

Investment in agriculture is nearly \$200 billion, equal to three-fifths of the market value of all corporation stocks on the New York Stock Exchange.

Agriculture, this biggest of the Nation's industries, is composed of 3.7 million independent producers.

Agriculture is a good customer. The farmers spend \$25 to \$26 billion a year for goods and services to produce crops and livestock; another \$15 billion a year for the same things that city people buy—food, clothing, drugs, furniture, appliances, and other products and services.

Each year the farmers' purchases include: \$2.5 to \$3 billion in new farm tractors and other motor vehicles, machinery, and equipment; \$3.5 billion for fuel, lubricants, and maintenance of machinery and motor vehicles; farming uses more petroleum than any other single industry; total inventory of farm machinery alone is greater than the assets of the steel industry and five times that of the automobile industry.

Our Nation's agriculture is creator of employment. Four out of every ten jobs in private employment are related to agriculture.

Farming is an efficient, progressive industry. Productivity of the American farmer in the 1950's increased by 6½ percent a year. Output per man-hour in non-agricultural industry increased by about 2 percent a year. We will have something to say on productivity later.

Our agriculture is food supplier to the world. We are the world's largest exporter of agricultural products; \$4.8 billion in farm products were exported in 1960. This American agricultural abundance is a powerful force for world peace.

But in looking at the farmer's income from his labor and capital we find farm people in 1960 received 82 cents an hour income for farmwork. By contrast, 1 hour's work in a factory averaged \$2.29, and hourly earnings in food marketing averaged \$2.14.

These facts from the USDA leaflet surely point out the importance of our Nation's agriculture and also indicate some of our basic problems.

Let's look at Oregon's agriculture. Oregon State University's extension circular 683—the white one—gives us this information:

More than 40,000 families call Oregon farms home. Altogether these farms contain 21 million acres, a third of our State's total area.

Oregon's agriculture is the second largest primary industry in the State, generating more than a half billion dollars in buying power each year; employing more than 77,000 workers—more than employed in the wood products industry, or the contract construction industry, or transportation, communications, and public utilities.

Oregon's farming industry involves farm investments totaling \$2.5 billion. This figure is equal to the total assets of all Oregon's banks or two-thirds of the annual income received by all Oregonians.

Oregon's farm investments average \$32,000 for each Oregon farmworker, equalling twice the investment for each U.S. factory worker.

Oregon produces many agricultural products that enter into export trade. Farm products account for 4 out of every 5 tons exported at Portland, Ore.

So it goes without question—agriculture and agricultural growth is of vital importance to every citizen in Oregon. A healthy, profitable agriculture is of vital necessity to the economic stability and growth of our Nation.

Peter Drucker, well-known management consultant, and economist, as quoted in the Oregon School of Business Administration publication, "Business Developments, 1961," in a talk given right here in Portland, Ore., stated:

"The recession and the international deficit in our balance of payments are caused by the failure of our economy to improve its productivity during the last decade. There has been, of course, considerable productivity increase—but it has been confined to one segment, farming. If we deduct the fast rise in farm productivity from the total figures, we find practically no increase in productivity at all. Output has grown with the labor force—productivity simply has not grown at all. We do not utilize our resources, other than farmland any better than we did 10 years ago."

V. E. Rossiter, Sr., writing in the Banker, February 1962 issue, writes:

"By 1960 farmers were producing and marketing nearly 30 percent more physical production than had been produced and marketed in the 1947-49 period. In this same period of time—some 11 to 13 years—it cost the farmer 50 percent more to produce his products, his gross income increased only 13 percent and his net profit declined 22 percent for the period."

How do these things affect us? One important way is the cost of living. Let's look at the cost of living around the world for a minute:

Cost-of-living climb in the last 10 years, by selected nations

	Percent
France.....	42
Britain.....	29
Japan.....	28
Italy.....	22
Germany.....	18
United States.....	13

We all know wages increased greatly in this country the past 10 years—industrial goods and services increased substantially in price. Peter Drucker says productivity didn't increase; then, how did the United States end up with the lowest increase in the cost of living? The answer is the tremendous productivity increase in agriculture and the attendant drastic decline in food prices at the farm level have largely been responsible in recent years for keeping our economy relatively stable.

But, meanwhile back at the ranch, the better job our farmers did the past 10 years, the poorer they came out economically—they have produced themselves into depression conditions. Another way of saying this is—the farmer today has to trade the product of approximately 3 hours of his labor for the product of 1 hour of labor in manufacturing industries. This imbalance of price and profit opportunity between agriculture and industry of this Nation must be corrected before we can hope to enjoy balanced opportunity for all of us. Now this gets down to you and me, doesn't it?

Well, what to do about it all? I am not sure anyone knows for positive, but we have

a lot of people and interests putting forth statements and opinions including myself. Briefly I will mention two of these.

The Committee for Economic Development—a business group composed of top level industry leaders—has recently completed an independent and searching study of the farm problem, entitled "An Adaptive Program for Agriculture." This Committee for Economic Development report correctly diagnosed the basic farm problem as imbalance between production and demand caused mainly by excess resources in agriculture. The Committee for Economic Development proposal is designed to raise income from farming without extensive Government control or subsidy. They would do this in a transitional 5-year period by relocating some 2 million farmers into the cities and doing away with all controls, subsidies, and supports during the transition period.

The National Council of Farmer Cooperatives says the proposal will not be effective for at least three main reasons. I agree. Here they are:

1. It fails to recognize that the free market in agriculture will not reduce total production or adequately adjust total production in relation to demand.

2. It fails to recognize the influence of economic organization and structure of agriculture and output.

3. It fails to recognize the importance of many resources other than labor which influence output.

We haven't time to explore these reasons in detail. Suffice to say that they are fundamental, deep seated, and realistic.

The second source, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, spearheaded by Orville Freeman, in its "Food and Agriculture—A Program for the 1960's" points out that there are four distinct but related goals that warrant most serious consideration. These are abundance—to expand food consumption, both domestic and foreign; balance—to adjust the production of commodities now in serious oversupply; conservation—to achieve better land use; and development—to upgrade economic opportunity for rural people.

This is a humane program. It is practical and workable. It is a program that faces facts squarely. Here are some of those facts:

Fact: The technological revolution in agriculture is real and nonreversible.

Fact: Agriculture can produce more than the market can take and will continue to do so—as far ahead as we can see.

Fact: Agriculture—made up as it is of many individual units—is not able by itself to make desired adjustments to excess supply or reduced demand. Generally, lower farm prices do not assure lower total farm output, unless the price declines are extreme and sustained. Farmers are linked to the land by a long heritage, not simply dollars and cents. They often increase their output despite lower prices in a lonely effort to stay in business.

Fact: Large budget expenditures cannot be made indefinitely to acquire stocks of commodities that we do not need.

Fact: Farmer income has been at unsatisfactory levels relative to incomes of non-farm people.

Facts: The economies of smalltown and rural America are dependent upon a prosperous agriculture.

Fact: If agriculture were to be returned to a free market situation, farmers would experience a searing farm depression. In such an event farm prices and incomes would fall to disaster levels and stay there a long time.

Programs planned and based on such facts can be made to work. If this be so, then why haven't we got the job done? So long as agriculture is to be the playing field for a political football game and subject to pressures political, we will have difficulty arriving at a sensible solution.

The most interesting suggestion we have heard is the one to create a Federal Farm Board somewhat in the image of the Federal Reserve Board and thereby ultimately remove the uncertainty and unpredictable outcomes of the political football contests from year to year.

Meanwhile, back at the ranch—so let's get down to business. Agriculture in Oregon and the Pacific Northwest is a leading industry and an economic spearhead of our regional economy. This will be true for many years to come. The large areas of cropland—rangeland combined with our God-given resources of water, rainfall, and growing climate dictate that the best economic use of these resources is agriculture—will be agriculture. Generally, in the early years of developing natural resources the emphasis of the developer is on turning the resource into the simplest form of cash. Certainly a worthy objective. Two good examples of this historical economic tendency is our timber industry and agriculture. The timber industry, for nearly a hundred years has cut and sold logs and sawed lumber for cash. Only recently has the complete utilization and further manufacturing operators come into the Pacific Northwest field. Today the cash sawmill operator and lumber seller is in a status quo if not declining position.

The agriculture industry of our Pacific Northwest has for nearly 100 years placed emphasis on growing cash crops. The vast dryland grain areas produce grain to be sold for cash. The hay man produces hay for cash. The main proportion of our agricultural land area has been utilized to produce the most effective immediate cash crops. There are signs that "immediate cash crop" economics is not adequate to sustain a growing agriculture in the Pacific Northwest. This is particularly true of our dryland grain areas of the Pacific Northwest. Only so much grain can be sold in the form of cereal-bread food products. The export market has been using vast quantities of our grain exported by Government subsidy. World markets for grain are totally controlled by state of governments. There is no such thing as a world free market. Each nation is aggressively encouraging their own farmers to produce—the technological revolution is just starting in these foreign countries, many of which have been paying out dollars for our cash crops.

So, meanwhile back at the ranch, I sit owning (through no astuteness on my part—I just had a good father and mother who worked like the devil and successfully gambled a lifetime on farming)—so I sit owning 1,000 acres of real good dryland grain area. I get a crop of grain off this land every other year. The property tax takes approximately \$8,000 out of each crop. This is all right if I can expect a reasonable opportunity for (1) a ready market for my grain produced and (2) a market which will pay me a price that represents reasonable parity with the wage levels demanded by labor and prices charged by industry in the United States. In order to meet these requirements it seems obvious—almost elementary, dear Watson—that we must change some of our agricultural production and marketing concepts. The basis of America's meat rich diet is grain. We, here in the Pacific Northwest, must wake up and get busy converting our grain, grass, and fiber into meat animals as a means of keeping a balanced, healthy, and growing agricultural economy for our area. The following statements, facts, and figures illustrate the basic economics involved:

1. The farmer and his community get more of the consumer's retail food dollar when the farmer and his community produce, fatten, and market meat animals as compared to producing and selling cash crops.

2. Livestock can convert and concentrate about 7 pounds of dry matter feed (grain,

grass, hay silage, concentrates) into 1 pound of highly nutritious animal foods. Thus, each meat animal is a small local factory capable of using the local products of our soil and converting these to a product our people want, need, and use.

3. In the United States the per capita consumption of cereal grain products as a food has been declining for over 40 years. The flour-food milling industry of the Pacific Northwest today uses less than 10 million bushels per annum of Pacific Northwest produced wheat. One county, our Umatilla County, can produce this amount of wheat.

4. Seventy percent of the cereal grains produced in the Pacific Northwest are now dependent on foreign export market use—or Government storage.

5. The total poultry and livestock activity of the Pacific Northwest has not materially changed in over 30 years. Yet the population of the area has increased tremendously in those 30 years.

6. The Pacific slope States import approximately 80 percent of the pork consumed by their populations. The State of Washington ships in from other areas about 20 percent of the beef consumed in the State of Washington.

Since the war years, our major agricultural industry in the Pacific Northwest—grain production—the best and often only economic resource use of vast dry land areas awakened to find that: (a) it had lost ground in the cereal food market; (b) had missed its share of the growing meat animal markets in the area; (c) was almost solely dependent on Government price and export programs; (d) had no future plan or program (independent of Government action) for changing the picture.

Our people started looking for answers. There is a logical, sound, economic solution to this Pacific Northwest area production and marketing problem. The Pacific Northwest is well located and endowed with all the basic resources necessary to competitively produce meat. The present area populations of California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho provide a substantial market at our back door. The future growth of this area's population can provide a growing market for the products of our land through meat animals.

Let's take a quick look at the economics of this area market. The annual per capita consumption of flour and cereal products in this Nation is only about 145 pounds per person and declining. The per capita consumption of meat is about 190 pounds per year and going strong. When I eat 190 pounds of meat a year—which I like—I am consuming roughly 755 pounds of grain—more than I will ever eat in the form of flour or cereal products. The following illustrates the point:

Annual per capita meat consumption converted to pounds of grain

	Annual per capita meat consumption (dressed weights, pounds)	Pounds of grain
Beef.....	85	340
Pork.....	65	334
Chicken.....	28	57
Turkey.....	7	20
Lamb and mutton.....	5	4
Total.....	190	755

This 755 pounds of grain which you and I eat annually in the form of meat animals is equal to about 14 bushels of grain per person.

Now let us apply this average (14 bushels) figure to populations of the States of Oregon, Washington, and California and see how



many bushels of grain are now being consumed in these States annually in the form of meat animal products:

State	Population	Bushel factor	Grain consumed (bushels)
Oregon.....	1,768,687	14	24,761,618
Washington.....	2,863,214	14	39,994,996
California.....	15,717,204	14	220,040,856
Total.....			284,747,470

Most of us are astounded when we see the size of annual grain consumption via meat products. After surprise, we become nonplussed to learn that our Pacific Northwest agriculture or California's agriculture is not deriving the main benefits from this economic activity. No, we are exporting our dollars to buy meat products to be shipped in to us. As we import these meat products from other areas we are buying their grass, their hay, their grain, their fiber, their processing, their labor, their services—and letting our economic opportunities go hang. It has been estimated that the importation of meat animals and finished meat products into the States of Oregon, Washington, and California presently amount to an annual wholesale processed value of some \$500 to \$600 million a year. The Pacific Northwest farmer, businessman, professional man, and laboring man cannot afford to ignore these sound, simple economics if we wish to have a balanced, growing, profitable area economy.

Why isn't someone doing something about all this? Someone is. For the past 8 to 10 years there has been a well sustained growth and interest in livestock enterprises. Substantial investments have been made by individuals and companies. For example cash farm marketings from animal products in 5 years (1955-61) doubled in Umatilla County, going from \$6 million to \$12 million. Cattle feeding mushroomed, the turkey industry took new hope, and people started back into the hog business. Things went along well until some 15 months ago the emergency feed grain legislation and the attendant farm program legislative squabbles resulted in our Pacific Northwest feed grain prices being consistently \$10 to \$16 per ton higher than feed grain prices in other major feed grain livestock areas. These differences which are the result of the administration of Government programs and policies are inequitable and unfair to our area feeders. Our livestock feeders cannot exist and consistently pay \$10 to \$16 per ton more for their raw product—feed grain—than their competitors in the Midwest.

We took this serious problem to Secretary Freeman a year ago and his department recognized the problem and instituted a temporary milo release program last fall which enabled our feeders to exist last year. However, the problem is back with us again—like a biting sow.

Oregon State University and Washington State University have prepared complete economic studies documenting the seriousness of our position. The congressional delegations of the three Pacific Northwest States have functioned as a group. We have had fine assistance from our Oregon group with MORSE, NEUBERGER, GREEN, and ULLMAN taking special interest. We have tied many of the agricultural grain, livestock, and poultry interests together in a Pacific Northwest Feed Grain & Livestock Council. On August 2, representatives of this council along with Senators MORSE, NEUBERGER, MAGNUSON, JACKSON, and Congressmen ULLMAN and MAY personally presented our documented case to Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture. We are now waiting for the Secretary to make his administrative decision on what will be done, if anything, to correct our inequitable situation. In the meantime, our Pacific Northwest turkey, broiler, and hog indus-

tries are precariously hanging on the verge of liquidation. This must not be allowed to happen.

This is another major example like the lumber industry problem, and the Hanford project where the logical production and marketing economics of an area get hamstrung under the political and administrative procedures of Federal legislation and programs.

The answer is obvious that the people and interests of the Pacific Northwest must develop awareness, then we must unite, and finally stand up and fight.

I would like to summarize what I have said today. Agriculture is the Nation's biggest industry. Its productivity has exceeded that of labor and industry. For this ability to produce its reward has been lower prices at the farm and lower profits for the farmer. Declining prices in food products at the farm level has materially offset rising prices in other segments of our economy. This largest industry must become profitable if we expect our national economy to remain healthy.

Removing people from the farm and placing agriculture in a totally free production and marketing economy will not result in a healthy, profitable agriculture. Government direction, action, and control in some degree is necessary.

Agricultural policy in this Nation must be removed from the political football field so that Government direction, action, and necessary controls can be based upon sound economic reasoning to arrive at what is good for agriculture, our people, and our Nation. Commodity problems and concepts must be considered. Area production and marketing concepts must be fairly evaluated.

Agriculture in the Pacific Northwest is and always will be one of our major industries. There is no other way to better use our large areas of crop and range lands. Our agriculture cannot grow unless we can market what we produce profitably. The Pacific Northwest agriculture cannot continue to depend so heavily on shipping primary raw products out of the area.

In every way possible we must upgrade these products by processing within the area. We need those jobs—we need those markets.

Conversion of Pacific Northwest grain, grass, hay, and fiber into meat animals to become the chief meat-producing region of the west coast offers tremendous economic opportunities for all of us.

We must base our position on logic and sound economic reasoning. We must be prepared and able to make our position known and respected. So much will depend on the attitudes and actions of our leadership of the various segments of the Pacific Northwest area. Now is the time for all good leaders to come to the aid of our great Pacific Northwest in the full development and use of our God-given natural resources.

Meanwhile back at the ranch, we are like sitting ducks on "Lake Federal" waiting for the decision on adverse feed grain price relationships which have largely been created by Government action and hence have to be corrected by Government action.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is my hope that the Secretary of Agriculture will follow where the facts lead and will recognize through positive action on the part of the Department the fairness and equity of our case.

In any event, I strongly urge that before final action is taken by the Department that the Secretary will give most careful consideration to this latest brief from a very responsible spokesman for the livestock industry of the Pacific Northwest.

The very least, it would seem to me, that the Department should do would

be to indicate to our poultry and livestock producers what price relationship between barley and corn must obtain before the Government will take action.

It may be argued that feed grain prices have broken slightly in the past month or weeks. It is my understanding that this is a normal drop for this time of year. The important point, however, is that our turkey, poultry, hog, and livestock producers must know with reasonable certainty what the Government plans to do so that they can plan their own operations. I gravely fear that, unless departmental policies are changed, far too many will be forced out of business.

Northwest feeders must have an equal opportunity to purchase feed grains at prices which are not higher than the normal price differentials of Midwest corn and milo.

The result of the feed grain program during the past 2 years has been near disastrous for Northwest feeders. It will become a major disaster if nonnormal price relationships continue.

I feel, and so do our farmers, that until the underlying inequity is corrected it will not be possible to place our livestock, turkey, and poultry industries upon a sound basis. The dollar of farm income, as I have often said, rings in the cash registers of Main Street throughout our region, as elsewhere. We should not continue to place, by Government action, an inequitable burden upon our Pacific Northwest farm people, who, after all, are trying to bring our towns and cities nourishing food at reasonable prices. An equitable feed grain policy for the Pacific Northwest can be a strong economic tool to achieve this desirable end.

Mr. President, at the heart of the controversy which has arisen over the feed grain problem is a very delicate subject. It is a subject which in my judgment must be discussed in the open. It is a subject which may place me in conflict, but I hope not in controversy, with the Department of Agriculture. I speak not alone. I speak for other Senators and for Representatives from the Pacific Northwest.

I wish the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Orville Freeman, to take note of what I say on the floor of the Senate today. We in the Pacific Northwest do not feel that we are receiving fair, adequate, and proper consideration of the feed grain program in the Pacific Northwest as it affects the livestock and the poultry feeders of our country.

I have listened to the Secretary's staff members express their rationalizations up to now on the Department's do-nothing policy with regard to this subject. However, the Secretary of Agriculture and his assistants cannot change the law of mathematics. They cannot make two and two equal anything but four; nor can they change the fact that adding nothing to nothing still ends with nothing.

The delicate problem to which I refer is that the policy of the Department of Agriculture with regard to the feed grain discrimination against the Pacific Northwest results in nothing but favoritism to the storage interests of the Middle West,

to the detriment of the feeders of the Pacific Northwest.

It is news to me that the surplus commodity program of the United States encompasses any plan to enrich the storage interests of America. I had always thought that our aim so far as the surplus commodity program in this country is concerned, was to get it used. Our object was not to store at great cost to the taxpayers of the United States.

When the Department of Agriculture does not give us the relief we need in the Pacific Northwest to end the unfair discrimination from which our feeders are suffering, in comparison with the advantages given to feeders in the Middle West, it must be charged, as I now charge the Department of Agriculture, with a program which, in effect, favors the storage people of the country.

The senior Senator from Oregon is taking the position, in speaking for the congressional delegations of the Pacific Northwest, that we must get milo out of storage. We want to get this milo into the feed troughs of the Pacific Northwest so that our feeders can, at the least, compete on an equal footing with Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other great feedlot centers of this country.

We are confronted with an unfair discrimination of from \$7 per ton up of discrimination favoring the Middle West feed lots. In recent times, as reported by Mr. Hill, this has risen to \$18 per ton and has been consistently at a \$10 to \$16 a ton level.

So I say once again to the Secretary of Agriculture: "Take a look at the facts and follow where they lead. I am well aware of all the pressures that come from the Midwest. I am well aware of the powerful lobby of the storage houses of America, which are making millions of dollars from storing surplus grains. I am aware that they like to get the grain stored in order to collect from the American taxpayers what amounts to a huge waste of taxpayer dollars.

"However, Mr. Secretary, you cannot justify continuing this discrimination against the feed lot operators of the Pacific Northwest. We are entitled to have some of the surplus milo and other feed grains shipped to the Pacific Northwest to be made available at fair prices to our feed lot producers. We should not be everlastingly told that we must continue to compete against Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other feed lot centers of this country, with a handicap of well over a \$7 per ton, plus, adverse differential because of the policies of the Department of Agriculture."

Our feed lot producers have submitted the evidence which supports the choice that I recommend. As between keeping the grain in storage and putting it into livestock and poultry, the choice is a clear one. We should use it to feed our livestock in order to provide a better diet for our people.

When we put the milo or other grain into our feed lots, we are putting it into great private enterprise institutions. It will come as a surprise, I am sure, to the American people generally—and I am not so sure, although we tried to make it clear, that this will not come also as a surprise to some people in the Depart-

ment of Agriculture—that the States of Washington and Oregon do not produce all of their own meat supply. A large percentage of the meat supply of the Pacific Northwest is shipped into the Pacific Northwest as finished product.

"But," people say, "Mr. Senator, I thought Oregon was a great cattle raising State. I thought that Washington also raised much cattle."

Both States, are, but we still both remain economic colonies of the East and of the Middle West. We are still great raw material States, not finished product States. We still suffer great economic discrimination. We have fought for years, for example, to bring to an end the freight differential of the Pacific Northwest, which puts us at an economic disadvantage with many other parts of the country.

What happens? Our feeder cattle, our young stock, is shipped from Washington and Oregon into the feed lots of the Middle West.

After slaughter in the packinghouses of the Middle West, the finished carcasses are shipped back across the country. They come back to Oregon and to Washington, thus supplying us with a large share of our meat requirements.

I am waiting for agricultural economists in the Department of Agriculture to justify this economic waste. I maintain that it cannot be justified. We could feed our own feeders and finish our own meat supply if we were to receive some help on this problem.

The Department of Agriculture has a responsibility to see to it that this kind of economic discrimination is brought to an end. We ought to have the right, and the opportunity, on an equal, competitive basis, to finish our own livestock in our own feed lots. We ought not to have our thousands and thousands of heads of feeders shipped for fattening into the Kansas City, Chicago, Des Moines, and other Midwest feed lot areas, only to be shipped back to us as finished carcasses.

We are asking only for an equal and a fair break on the feed grain problem. It can be done. It has happened on a couple of rare occasions in certain emergencies. It happened once when a few thousand tons of milo were shipped to the Pacific Northwest. I told the Secretary of Agriculture, when it happened more than a year ago, that this action was of great benefit to us. I recall one other occasion when some milo was shipped to the southeastern part of the United States. It was a sound program then; it would be a sound program if renewed now.

As I enter this caveat today, I say to the administration that there, in my judgment, is an opportunity to do something about the cost of storage of surplus grain. Here is a way to do something to stimulate the private enterprise system by seeing to it that the surplus grain program of the Government does not work an economic injustice to every feed lot operator and every turkey and poultry producer in the Pacific Northwest.

I am sorry I have found it necessary to come to the floor of the senate to make so strong a statement as I have made

this morning. I have tried to avoid doing so, because for many weeks we have tried to have the problem settled in the Department of Agriculture on a negotiated basis.

It is not the fault of the Secretary of Agriculture; he is very much concerned with many other matters. But I say, most respectfully, that we feel it is the fault of the staff in lower echelons of the Department of Agriculture. I want them to know that the senior Senator from Oregon does not know what it means to accept a brush-off. I say to the Secretary of Agriculture that I do not intend to accept a brush-off on this issue. I intend to take the issue to the country in the weeks immediately ahead. I shall continue to ask the Department: When will you start to give common justice to the feedlot operators, the hog, poultry, and turkey producers of the Pacific Northwest?

#### STORM DAMAGE TO OREGON

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, beginning yesterday afternoon and continuing much of last night, a storm of hurricane proportions, possibly unequaled in the history of my State, ravaged not only Oregon but other parts of the Pacific Northwest. Exceptionally heavy damage was done in my State. It is not yet known what the total amount of damage is or what the total loss of life or number of casualties will be, although I have been greatly relieved to receive, in the last long-distance telephone call, the information that the estimated loss of life is less than 25. Long-distance telephone calls have been received from Oregon for many hours, so we pray and hope that the estimate is correct. There is no way of knowing yet the number of persons who have been injured.

I was told in the latest message that all the telephones are "out" in the southern part of Oregon. I have been trying to reach my hometown to learn the extent of the damage there, but telephonic communications with that area have not yet been established. However, according to reports which have been relayed from that area to Portland, the damage apparently has been pretty much limited to the loss of buildings. In some areas, such as Junction City, major fires have occurred. Several lumber mills in my county have burned down. There has been a severe loss to the power utilities and a great loss by way of damage to automobiles, personal property, and trees. This morning the Governor declared that part of the State to be a disaster area.

I express my appreciation to the administration for the cooperation I have received this morning, for I presented this problem early this morning to the White House, where it received the attention of Mr. Ralph Dungan. I asked that he proceed to initiate whatever Federal procedures are necessary to determine what, if any, Federal assistance can be given to the disaster area in my State. I am sure that upon a determination of the facts, the Federal Government will in this instance, as it has been in the case of any other disaster or tragedy which



has struck our country, be of every assistance as the law allows. I have given that assurance to the people of my State. However, I wished to make a statement on the floor of the Senate at this time, so that there would be public knowledge of the fact that we are all working together in an endeavor to provide such assistance as is possible.

My counsel has just handed me a news-ticker dispatch which corrects a figure given me in the latest long-distance telephone call. I am sorry to have to report that, according to this dispatch, the estimated loss of life has been increased. The Associated Press dispatch from Portland, Oreg., reads, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.—A howling storm with wind gusting to more than 100 miles per hour left at least 26 persons dead and a broad band of devastation along the west coast today.

That made a 2-day toll of 35 killed by successive storms, with 13 dead in Oregon, 11 in California, 8 in Washington, and 3 in British Columbia.

National Guard units and all available police were on duty in the Portland area to curb looting, which began after the wind smashed hundreds of store windows yesterday.

The fury of the storm was felt as far as 125 miles inland, where it was finally blunted by the Cascade Mountains.

At one time three trains were reported missing between Seattle and Portland. It turned out they were delayed by trees and debris on the tracks, but with all communications out, it took hours to locate them.

A storm of this kind in my section of the country is really unheard of. In my years in Oregon, I do not recall a storm having winds which reached a velocity of more than 100 miles an hour. I mention this item on the floor of the Senate today on behalf of the people of my State, the Governor of my State, and other Government officials. I wish to express appreciation to the Federal Government for the cooperation which is being extended to us and for whatever assistance can be given to us to alleviate the suffering and the losses which the people of my State are undergoing in this tragedy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. METCALF in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FACILITATION OF ENTRY OF CERTAIN ALIENS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3361) to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes. I ask unani-

mous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read, for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, pp. 23421-23422, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, as passed by the Senate, S. 3361 provided for the admission in a nonquota status of certain skilled aliens whose services are urgently needed in the United States and of certain close relatives of U.S. citizens, and also provided authority for the Attorney General to create a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the United States in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1962.

Sections 1, 2, and 3, as agreed on by the conferees, are identical to both the Senate version and the House version of the bill.

Section 4 of the bill, as agreed on by the conferees, is in the nature of a substitute for the provisions contained in the Senate version of the bill which would have permitted the Attorney General to create a record of lawful admission for permanent residence in the cases of certain aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. Section 4 now provides a procedure within the framework of the suspension of deportation procedures presently contained in section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act. The aliens affected will be granted substantially the same relief that they would have received under the provisions of section 4 of the Senate version of the bill, with a requirement that the action of the Attorney General in suspending deportation be reported to the Congress for approval.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, since the distinguished majority leader has already outlined this measure, I shall take only a few minutes of the Senate's time to discuss it.

I must express my regret that the measure is not more comprehensive. It serves to emphasize the great importance of having, early in the next session, a thorough consideration of our immigration statutes, in order to remove from them certain discriminatory features and in order to help unite families which today are separated because of some of their harsh provisions.

Under the bill now before us, it is my judgment, Mr. President, based on reliable estimates, that a total of 7,000 aliens in the first preference or skilled specialist category, will be permitted to enter the United States freed of quota restrictions; or, if they are already in the United States on a temporary basis, they will be eligible to have their status adjusted to that of permanent residents.

In the fourth preference group, some have said that approximately 16,000 alien relatives of American citizens will be able to come to this country. Mr. President, I would just like to stress that

this 16,000 estimate is based on the number of fourth preference aliens who are on consular waiting lists with a registration date prior to March 31, 1954. The mere fact of their registration on the list, plus their eligibility under this bill, will not necessarily mean that the full estimated number of 16,000 will actually come to America. Among the names registered so long ago on consular lists are those who have since died, moved, or, for one reason or another, simply changed their mind about emigrating to the United States. In my considered opinion, not more than 10,000 to 12,000 of those eligible under this bill will actually derive its benefits. I stress this, not by any means to belittle this bill, which I think is much needed, but to show how, relatively speaking, we are dealing with a mere trickle of immigration in passing stopgap measures as this.

Mr. President, as this bill passed the Senate 8 days ago, section 4 of the bill amended present section 249 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by changing from 1940 to 1952 the cutoff date of entry for persons eligible for certain administrative relief. In the other body, an amendment was offered and agreed to, striking this section 4.

In its stead, the other body agreed to a second amendment inserting a new section 4 in the bill relating to the present Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs in the State Department.

I am happy to say, however, that the conferees in behalf of the other body were persuaded to recede from this amendment, and their reasonableness in this regard is to be commended. I am confident that when the House amendment treating the organization of the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs comes before the appropriate Senate committee in the due course of orderly legislative process, it will receive fair consideration and will stand or fall on its own true merits.

The conferees of both bodies also believed it desirable to restore to this bill a section permitting adjustment of status for certain aliens illegally in the United States. Instead of the amendment to section 249 which was contained in section 4 of this bill as it was passed by this body, the conferees agreed upon an amendment to the present section 244 of the act. No person who would have been eligible for administrative relief under section 249 as the Senate proposed and amended it, would be excluded from consideration for relief under section 244 as the conference report now proposes to amend it. Section 244 as amended would permit aliens who have been physically present in the United States for 7 years, or, in more serious cases, for 10 years, to apply to the Attorney General for a suspension of deportation as under present section 244. The alien would have to show a specified degree of hardship to either himself or his spouse and children if he were to be deported as required by law. Should the Attorney General believe the application meritorious, he would recommend suspension of deportation to the Congress as under present law, and the Congress by resolution could approve the recommendation, suspend the alien's deporta-

tion, and adjust his status to that of permanent residence.

Mr. President, I would have personally preferred a suspension of deportation provision which would have made available to those eligible a completely administrative remedy, rather than bringing the Congress itself into the process. I do not see any reason for the Congress, when enacting legislation of a general nature in the immigration field, to inject itself into its administration on a case-by-case basis. Such a procedure simply makes for unnecessary labor within the respective committees of the Congress—almost as much labor, indeed, as would be involved if the problem were to be handled through private bills, which presumably the general legislation is designed to curb or eliminate.

The conference amendment to section 244 does have at least one advantage over the earlier Senate-passed amendment to section 249. Section 249, as the Senate proposed to amend it, would have applied only to aliens who entered the United States prior to December 24, 1952. The conference version of section 244, on the other hand, has continuing future applicability to any alien who can satisfy either the 7- or the 10-year physical presence requirement in addition to the other criteria for suspension of deportation. On balance, this continuing applicability of section 244 persuades me that the conference proposal is certainly not so objectionable that it should stand in the way of approval of this conference report.

I believe all those who worked to obtain enactment of this measure in these last days of the Congress deserve commendation. There was every likelihood until very late in the session, that no immigration bill would be considered by the Congress before adjournment. This would have been most unfortunate and I am very pleased that at least this measure has been approved. It does not begin to resolve all of the inequities in the present law, but there is no doubt that it will provide relief in many worthy cases.

I therefore urge approval of the report. Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I join the Senator from New York in his statement in regard to this measure. As one who joined in the introduction of a number of immigration bills, particularly for the purpose of making it easier to modernize the quotas which were established in the period from 1920 to 1960, I believe Congress has done very little to make it more possible for the relatives of American citizens to enter this country. The other day I spoke on this matter.

I take this occasion to join the Senator from New York in hoping that the 1st session of the 88th Congress will concern itself with making the necessary improvements in our immigration laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### THE STORY OF CHAVEZ RAVINE

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD "The Story of the Chavez Ravine" in the city of Los Angeles, Calif. It was originated in 1830 by Julian Chavez, a 27-year-old New Mexican, who went to the Pueblo of Los Angeles that year.

There being no objection the story was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### THE STORY OF CHAVEZ RAVINE

Chavez Ravine in Los Angeles takes its name from Julian Chavez, a young New Mexican who came to the Pueblo of Los Angeles in the 1830's.

Chavez probably arrived late in 1835—as indicated by the old city archives—the year Mexico honored the pueblo by making it a city (ciudad) and the capital of Alta California. The 1836 census listed Julian Chavez, gave his age as 27, and his occupation as laborer.

In Chavez' time, to get a lot or a small farm, a man went to the city council—then called the ayuntamiento—and asked for a specific piece of vacant land. Los Angeles, having been founded in 1781 as a Spanish pueblo, was by law the owner of four square leagues of land centering at its plaza. The city, accordingly, was the chief source of land for the townsmen. Councilmen spent most of their time hearing petitions from the land-hungry or passing on reports from its land committee to which most of these petitions were referred.

Young Chavez was ambitious. On arriving in town he tried to get land for agricultural purposes. His first request was turned down though soon afterward in 1836 he got a town building lot. He was not discouraged and kept on with his agricultural petitions. He worked hard to get the council of the 1830's to say "yes," for the name of Julian Chavez was well sprinkled through the pages of the old archives devoted to the doings of the council in Mexican days.

Finally he got his land, which ultimately became known as Chavez Ravine. At first the people called it "Corralitos" because of the small corrals for his cattle and horses, which he installed there—following a New Mexican custom little known to Californians.

At this time Los Angeles was the hub of the ranches, the trading and social center of the southern California cattle country. To its plaza all roads led, bringing in fast-galloping horsemen and slow-moving, ox-drawn carretas filled with women shoppers from the ranches which ringed the pueblo. From Chavez Ravine it was a short horseback ride on Eternity Street to get to the plaza, the shops, and the fandangos.

As the years went by, Julian Chavez acquired many friends and held several small offices, such as substitute auxiliary alcalde and judge of the waters. Finally, in 1846, he became a regidor, that is, a councilman. Now he could help pass on land applications himself. So important a man as Chavez could even get a rancho, too, and, with a friend named Leonardo Cota, high up in government circles, he was given a 6-league grant, the Rio de las Animas. Gov. Pio Pico was the donor, on behalf of the Mexican action—though, alas, the claim was later rejected by the United States.

The great excitement of 1846, however, one that caused the council to adjourn for over 6 months, was the raising of the American flag over Monterey on July 7 by Commodore Sloat of the U.S. Navy. This signaled the end of Mexican rule in California. Under the military government that was set up by the United States, local government was encouraged to continue as it had been doing. So, the Los Angeles Ayuntamiento (city council) took heart and resumed the normal activities of assigning land and settling all of the town's troubles and disputes.

It was in 1849, during the period of military rule, that the councilmen, somewhat Americanized, decided to sell their land instead of giving it to the settlers. Also, their treasury was empty. Under the rules laid down by the military, however, Los Angeles couldn't go into the real estate business and sell any of its unappropriated 4 square league area without reference to a map. The town had no map and no man capable of making one. Lt. E. O. C. Ord, of the U.S. Army, was assigned to the surveying job. He came up with the town's first map. It covered the heart of the 4 square leagues. It showed blocks, lots, vineyards, cornfields, and such streets as the Street of the Grasshoppers, Bull Street, Short Street, the Street of the Virginia, and Eternity Street. The last named highway led from the plaza to the pueblo's old cemetery and passed the entrance to Chavez Ravine. The ravine itself got into Ord's picture and was included in the hilly area of the map's upper right corner.

In April of 1850 the American form of government in Los Angeles County was organized. Later, municipal government was reformed along American lines, with mayor and council taking the place of alcalde and ayuntamiento. In the same year, too, California became a State in the Union. When the Federal census of the city of Los Angeles was taken that year, Julian Chavez was listed as a farmer, with a household of 13. His real estate—Chavez Ravine—was valued at \$800.

#### RESPONSIBILITIES OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a statement prepared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], containing a message from Mr. Herman H. Pevler, president of the Wabash Railroad, to its employees, dealing with the responsibilities of citizenship.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

##### STATEMENT BY SENATOR DIRKSEN

The strength of our country lies in its business leadership as well as in public life. An example of the type of leadership which this country needs if our representative form of government is to continue is Mr. Herman H. Pevler, president of the Wabash Railroad. In the Banner, a publication sent by the Wabash to its employees, Mr. Pevler's message to his fellow employees is:

"We are again approaching general elections, at which time Americans everywhere will exercise one of their most sacred prerogatives—the right to choose their representatives in local, State, and Federal Government.

"However, in years past, the record shows that off-year elections have inevitably resulted in an extremely light voter turnout, perhaps because the glamour and dynamics of a presidential choice were not present. This to me is tragic since the men we select to represent us at these levels of government



strongly influence the day-to-day operations of our great country.

"No citizen should make the error that his or her vote won't be missed; the sum total of those 'won't be missed' votes can turn the tide in any election.

"In addition to casting a ballot, all Americans should become active in the political party of their choice and work diligently in support of the candidates they feel are best qualified for public office. Too often the selection of legislators and public servants is left in the hands of a few precinct politicians. This invariably results in unhealthy political alliances.

"It is a great privilege to be an American, but with this privilege goes certain responsibilities we can't afford to ignore. Putting men of merit in public office is one. I urge all Wabash employees to fulfill their responsibility by going to the polls and voting for the candidates they feel are best qualified to serve."

#### CRITICISM OF BRITISH POLICY

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, yesterday, in an address delivered at Llandudno, Wales, British Foreign Minister Lord Home spoke in words disturbingly reminiscent of Neville Chamberlain's ill-fated phrase "I have brought home peace with honor." Incredible as it may seem, Lord Home emphasized with pride Britain's role in the unsatisfactory Lao settlement, which, even as he spoke, was being further undermined by the complete refusal of the Communist forces to heed its terms. We have kept our agreement in regard to Laos; but the Communists—as was to be expected—have completely ignored their commitments. To consider this Lao agreement anything more than a face-saving gesture, an umbrella against a hurricane, another Munich pact in Asia, is to mistake the wish for the reality.

Furthermore, Mr. President, at the same time that Lord Home was taking credit for the futile Allied gestures in Laos, the British Government was asking the U.S. Government to protect British shipping in the Caribbean, so that British magnates can continue reaping the profits of trade with Castro. Whereas, other NATO allies on the whole have been understanding of the need to curtail Castro's source of supply, the British and some of their Commonwealth associates have persistently put their own dollars-and-cents advantage above any other consideration. Just as there were British merchants who did not hesitate to sell arms and equipment to Hitler in the thirties, just as the British last year did not hesitate to sell Viscounts to Red China, and just as the British have consistently transgressed or weakened the COCOM restrictions on strategic trade with the Communists, so, too, in the Cuban trade situation, short-run gain is apparently put before long-range international objectives.

According to reports in the press, Lord Home gratuitously insulted the United States by telling a story about a young boy who was coming up an escalator the wrong way. According to Lord Home, he told the boy, "You cannot do that," to which the boy replied, "But I am an American." Lord Home then told his audience, saying he drew no moral, "I

turned him round and I put him back on the right and proper road."

I am afraid it is the British, who in my judgment, have been traveling the wrong road. We would be in serious trouble, indeed, if we followed the suggestions of Lord Home about the proper road to travel.

I was incensed when I read this report of Lord Home's speech. I am still angry about it. But I want to make one thing clear. As one who fought in two World Wars side by side with British men and officers, I know there are no more courageous, determined, or resourceful fighters than the British. And if I had to choose anyone with whom to stand with my back against the wall in a last-ditch struggle for survival, I would not hesitate to make that stand with a Britisher. When the chips are down, they are always superb.

But my point is this, Mr. President, the American people would prefer to meet and defeat communism without first placing our backs to the wall and throwing our chips to the ground. There is no reason why at this point we should continue to negotiate ourselves into a dead-end alley where the only alternative is complete surrender or all-out war. There are many other courses we can take today with regard to Cuba, Asia, trade with the Communists, Berlin, and other points of conflict with the Communists which will strengthen our hand and, in my judgment, make all-out conflict less, not more, likely. But such a policy demands more than mere negotiation and wishful thinking. It requires allied cooperation, and even economic sacrifice.

Mr. President, we are not playing tidilywinks with the Communists. We are involved in a serious and dangerous cold war struggle. We cannot afford to lose, and the kind of hesitation, gentleman's agreement, and timid diplomacy which played such a large part in bringing on World War II is even more out of date today than it was a quarter of a century ago. In facing the Communists, we must fight fire with fire and give up the dangerous habit of confusing the form and appearance of international agreement with the real substance of international security which we have so far been unable to achieve through diplomatic method.

#### SOVIET OIL OFFENSIVE

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, the severity of the threat posed to the security of this country by the Soviet oil offensive was graphically emphasized this week with the release of a report by the National Petroleum Council. This group is an advisory body to the Federal Government, and its membership includes 80 men who are leaders in the field of petroleum production, transport, and sale. Eighteen months ago, the council was asked by the Department of the Interior to make a factual study of the effects on the free world of the exports of oil from the Soviet bloc. A working committee, headed by George T. Piercy, of Standard Oil, and Robert Ebel, of the Department of the Interior, has

produced a voluminous, well-documented report which can only be described as startling.

The committee found that the Soviet Union is the repository of vast untapped oil reserves, and that crude oil production is increasing rapidly and far exceeding all official Soviet plans. Furthermore, the Russians are stepping up their ability to export petroleum by building a major pipeline system which they would not have been able to complete thus far without obtaining materials from the free world. West Germany, Italy, and Sweden alone will supply 40 percent of the entire requirements of the Soviet 7-year plan for 40-inch pipeline.

Our allies are also cooperating in this expansion by building Russian deep sea oil tankers in Western countries. The Soviet tanker fleet will be practically self-sufficient by 1965, and two-thirds of the new tonnage will have been supplied by the free world. It is indeed surprising that the Russians seem to be surpassing even their own production estimates in this field, and distressing that the nations of the free world have formulated no coordinated plan to meet the offensive.

Soviet bloc exports to Western Europe have grown, and in the estimation of the committee which has just produced this important report, Soviet bloc exports will continue to grow. This politically motivated trade offensive has three serious consequences:

First, it reduces the revenues of the oil producing nations of the West.

Second, it enables the Communists to obtain strategic goods and technology in return for oil, from the industrialized nations.

Third, it enables the Soviets to exert political pressure on underdeveloped countries which become dependent upon receiving Soviet oil.

In recent months, I have spoken out many times in an effort to alert the country to this very real danger. It is gratifying that this long-awaited report was finally released, and I commend the National Petroleum Council, and the members of the committee for their excellent presentation. Perhaps this report will serve to awaken the public and government officials to the harsh facts.

On October 26, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee will meet in New York to hear testimony relating to trade with the Soviet bloc. It is my hope that the witnesses at the hearing will be able to give us additional information on this oil problem in particular. With this objective in mind, the subcommittee staff is preparing to receive testimony from some of the men who compiled this excellent report.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RECESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair. At 2 o'clock p.m., the Senate reassembled, when called to order by Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana.

## DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U. S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., October 13, 1962.  
To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. LEE METCALF, a Senator from the State of Montana, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

CARL HAYDEN,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. METCALF thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 13, and 18 to the bill and concurred therein, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to the bill and concurred therein, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

## ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore:

H.R. 6371. An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the limitation on retirement income, and with respect to the taxable year for which the deduction for interest paid will be allowable to certain building and loan associations, mutual savings banks, and cooperative banks;

H.R. 8269. An act for the relief of Dr. Walter H. Duisberg;

H.R. 8517. An act to grant emergency officer's retirement benefits to certain persons who did not qualify therefor because their applications were not submitted before May 25, 1929; and

H.R. 10501. An act for the relief of Kenyon B. Zahner.

## PUBLIC WORKS AUTHORIZATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 13273) authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report. (For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, pp. 23400–23408, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, the report was agreed to by all the conferees, and is signed by all members of the conference committee.

The conferees carried on extensive and intensive deliberations, and reached an agreement which will make it possible to carry forward projects which are extremely vital to the improvement and strengthening of our economy.

There were a number of projects on which hearings had not been held on the House side, and on which the House conferees could not agree. The Senate receded very reluctantly on these projects; but we have received a commitment from the managers on the part of the House that the Committee on Public Works of the House will hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes, on the following projects which were considered by the conferees, and are not included in this conference report. They are Cape Fear River basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky., and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia; and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

Mr. President, I refer to page 48 of the conference report as presented to the House by Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee, a copy of which is on the desks of Senators, for the statement of the managers on the part of the House, as follows:

## EARLY HEARINGS

The managers on the part of the House made a commitment that the Committee on Public Works of the House would hold public hearings as soon as practicable after the next Congress convenes on the following projects which were considered by the conferees and which are not included in this conference report: Cape Fear River basin, N.C.; Flint River, Ga.; the South Fork of the Cumberland River, Ky. and Tenn.; Knowles Dam and Reservoir, Flathead River, Mont.; Burns Creek Dam and Reservoir, Snake River, Idaho; Waurika reclamation project, Oklahoma; Savannah River-Duke Power Co., South Carolina and Georgia, and Trotter's Shoal Reservoir, Savannah River.

There will also need to be a consideration with respect to basin authorizations, and perhaps other projects will be available for consideration by that time—early in 1963.

In that regard, the total cost of the projects contained in the bill as passed by the Senate was \$3,692,200,800. With the reductions made, the conference report provides for a total monetary authorization of \$2,260,220,000, and would authorize some 207 projects.

The largest item taken out of the bill in the conference was the sum of \$900,300,000 from basin authorizations. However, with the exception of the Los Angeles River basin, in California, there is enough remaining authorization from the Flood Control Act of 1960 to cover the appropriations made in the civil functions appropriation bill, 1962, for the fiscal year 1963.

With reference to the Los Angeles River basin, the appropriation in the current civil functions bill exceeded the existing authorizations by \$3,700,000. Therefore, the only basin authorization contained in this bill is the \$3,700,000 for the authorization required to cover the appropriations in the current appropriation bill for the Los Angeles River basin.

The situation now is that before the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1963 can be considered and enacted, to provide the necessary funds for the orderly continuation of the projects in the several basins, additional authorizations will have to be made. It was the belief of the Senate committee—and it was approved by the Senate—that since it was so late in 1962, it would be the part of wisdom to include in this bill additional basin authorizations; and that was done to the extent of approximately \$900 million. That was one of the items—and the largest one—taken out of this bill in conference. It does not mean that the authorizations will not be passed. They will have to be passed next year, ahead of next year's civil functions appropriation bill.

However, the House conferees insisted that those basin authorizations be deleted from this bill; and that was when they gave the assurance that early in 1963 they would hold hearings and would initiate proceedings, early in the session of Congress next year, for the passage of legislation including not only the additional basin authorizations which were taken out of this bill, and which will be required next year, but also they agreed, as I have stated, to hold hearings on these additional projects which were deleted from this bill.

Therefore, it is quite apparent that, while the conference committee reduced the amount provided in the bill from \$3,692,200,800 to \$2,260,220,000, the net result is that the difference between the two amounts will, of necessity, and in accordance with the commitment of the members of the House Public Works Committee, be before the Congress for its consideration next year.

With that explanation, I ask for approval of the conference report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.



Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Oklahoma referred to the agreement made by the House conferees that hearings would be held early next year upon various projects, including Devils Jump, which were not included in the bill reported by the conference. It was agreed also that these separate projects will be considered early next year in connection with the river basin projects, and if approved will be included in an omnibus bill, which will be acted upon by the Congress in 1963.

Mr. KERR. In the same bill that would provide additional river basin authorizations; that is correct.

Mr. COOPER. I note that river basin projects are not referred to in the paragraph on page 48 captioned "Early hearings." I am sure it was an oversight.

Mr. KERR. The Senator from Oklahoma does not regard it as an oversight. I think it was by reason of the fact that the managers on the part of the House took it for granted that Senators and Members of the House of Representatives both knew existing authorizations were about exhausted, and that of necessity legislation would be required early next year for additional basin authorizations. I think they had in mind to make clear and a matter of record their assurance that there would be hearings on the projects which were eliminated from the bill but which had been listed.

Mr. COOPER. I am sure that the Senator's description of the situation is correct. The projects listed in the statement of the House managers, and not included in the bill reported by the conference, if they should be approved by the House or Senate Public Works Committee, would become part of the omnibus bill which will have to be considered next year.

Mr. KERR. As the Senator from Kentucky is so well aware, because he spent so many days in the hearings of the committee, the projects which have been set forth in detail and which were deleted from the bill were all fully justified and shown to be worthy and meritorious by the reports of the various Government agencies—the Chief of Engineers, the Rivers and Harbors Board of the Corps of Engineers, the Bureau of Reclamation, and the Bureau of the Budget; and certainly they will be just as meritorious and worthy next year.

It will be the purpose of the Senator from Oklahoma, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Flood Control and Rivers and Harbors, along with other members of the subcommittee, including the Senator from Kentucky, who is the ranking Republican member, to hold hearings when the bill comes to be considered, and to include such projects in whatever authorization act we have next year.

Mr. COOPER. Let me say, on behalf of myself and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], that we are very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] for his leadership—and to the chairman of the committee, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ]—as well as to the

Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], for their valiant labors during the conferences with the House to uphold to the very end the Senate version of the bill. They did all it was possible for them to do to secure its adoption, and we thank them.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. While we were very much disappointed that we did not get the Cape Fear project in the bill, I am very grateful to the Senator from Oklahoma for the fine work he and his colleagues did in obtaining an agreement with the House conferees to hold hearings on the project next year, so it may be included in another bill. I want to thank every one of the Senators for the fine service they rendered. I know what they were up against. Nobody could have done more than they did. I am deeply grateful to every member of the conference committee on the Senate side, and I have no quarrel with Members of the House who were in the conference, because they were under orders and they did all they could do.

I appreciate the courtesy extended to me in letting me come into the conference and explain the project I was interested in, with the hope that I might be of help. It was not very helpful, but I thank Senators for their courtesy. With the agreement that has been made, we have assurance that this project will be considered next year, when the hearings will be held, and it can be passed on then. It is a fine project.

I appreciate the fine work done by the Senator from Oklahoma, as well as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG].

Mr. KERR. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina. It was with the deepest regret that the Senate conferees receded on the Cape Fear River basin project in North Carolina.

It had been approved by every Member of the North Carolina delegation in the House of Representatives except one. It had been vigorously fought for by the two great Members in the Senate from North Carolina. It had been approved by the Governor of North Carolina. It had been approved by the Chief of Engineers, the Board of Rivers and Harbors in the Corps of Engineers, and the Bureau of the Budget. It had a cost-benefit ratio of 2.5 to 1.

It developed that there was a road block in the form of a commitment in the Public Works Committee of the House to one member of the delegation in the House of Representatives from North Carolina that the project would not be accepted until further hearings had been held by the House Public Works Committee. The Senate conferees, not only with reference to this project, but with reference to the others that were deleted from the bill, were confronted with the simple proposition of accepting the position of the House and deleting those

projects or not having a bill this year. So it was impossible to keep those projects in the bill. When we received assurances of the managers of the bill on the part of the House of Representatives, being the majority of the members of the subcommittee of the House committee handling rivers and harbors, that hearings would be held on these projects early next year, the Senate conferees reluctantly receded in order that there might be a bill to bring to this Chamber.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, we, the citizens of South Carolina, are disappointed that the Duke project dam on the Savannah River, which had the approval of all the necessary Government agencies, which had been included in the House passed bill, and which also was included in the Senate passed bill, was deleted from the bill in conference.

I thank the distinguished Senator for the assurances he has given that early hearings will be held on this subject in January, or as soon thereafter as possible.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, following the report by the chairman of the conference committee on the part of the Senate, which the Senator has made, the news release on this matter that I issued, dated October 12, 1962.

There being no objection, the news release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR STROM THURMOND, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, ON RIVERS AND HARBORS AUTHORIZATION BILL, OCTOBER 12, 1962

I am disappointed that the conferees threw out the Duke Power project approval. It would cost the Government nothing. In fact, it would greatly benefit South Carolina and Georgia in both construction jobs and permanent employment. This \$280 million project by private enterprise would be the largest steam power generating plant in the world and would pay annual national taxes of approximately \$10 million, approximately \$7 million to the State and approximately \$1 million to Anderson County.

The conferees did give some indication that we might be able to win approval of the Duke project early next year. I will certainly work toward accomplishing this goal.

I was pleased that the conferees eliminated from the bill the Trotter's Shoal project. It has been estimated that the cost would be \$78.8 million, but as usual with power projects, the final cost could run to more than \$100 million. It would help create a desert for industrial development in the upper western part of South Carolina by eliminating many fine industrial sites. In fact, former Senator Charles E. Daniel says that at present this area provides some of the best industrial sites in this country.

While the Duke project had the approval of all necessary Government agencies, the Trotter's Shoal project did not have such an approval.

In addition to all this, the Trotter's Shoal project would block the construction of a \$50 to \$80 million paper plant operation near Calhoun Falls. In addition to the many jobs this plant would provide, its operations would result in greatly increasing the price of pulpwood in this area of

South Carolina and Georgia where tree farming is the principal farming pursuit.

Mr. THURMOND. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. W. B. McGuire, president of Duke Power Co., before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives in August 1962.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF W. B. MCGUIRE, PRESIDENT OF DUKE POWER CO., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL, COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, AUGUST 1962, H.R. 6789

My name is W. B. McGuire. I live in Charlotte, N.C., and am president of Duke Power Co. Personally, and on behalf of my company, I wish to thank the committee for the opportunity of presenting some facts which I hope will assist the committee in its deliberations upon H.R. 6789 which is presently before you.

#### PURPOSE OF APPEARANCE

Duke Power Co. proposes to construct a steam-electric generating plant on the Savannah River, in the area of Middleton

Shoals, between the Clark Hill and Hartwell Federal hydroelectric projects. In connection with this plant it will be necessary to build a diversion dam across the Savannah River, for which congressional approval must be obtained. It is through H.R. 6789, introduced by Congressman DORN, of South Carolina, in whose district the project would be built, that we seek this authorization. Our diversion dam across the river would be partly in Georgia in the district of Congressman STEPHENS, and we have kept him fully advised of our plans.

#### DUKE POWER CO.'S PROPOSED STEAMPLANT

Duke Power Co.'s proposed steamplant would be located on the northeast bank of the Savannah River in Anderson County, S.C., at river mile 296.7, about 8 miles below Hartwell Dam, and immediately upstream from the Sanders Ferry Bridge. The initial installation will contain two steam-electric generating units, each of at least 350,000 kilowatt capacity, but the site will be developed for the ultimate installed generating capacity of some 2 million kilowatts.

While there may be plants of this size in existence at the time of ultimate completion of Duke Power Co.'s plant, it is Duke's understanding that, today, a steam-electric generating plant of this capacity does not exist in the world. The following statistics with respect to this plant may be of interest:

	2,000,000-kilowatt steam-plant	700,000-kilowatt initial 2 units
Construction costs.....	\$280,000,000	\$91,000,000
Annual cost of operation and maintenance, including payroll but less fuel.....	\$2,500,000	\$1,150,000
Annual cost of fuel, including local railroad delivery.....	\$26,000,000	\$9,100,000
Annual local and State taxes, estimated on FPC basis.....	\$7,450,000	\$2,420,000
Annual Federal income taxes estimated on FPC basis.....	\$9,240,000	\$3,000,000
Installed capacity (kilowatts).....	2,000,000	700,000
Annual production (kilowatt-hours).....	10,000,000,000	3,500,000,000
Annual coal use (tons).....	3,500,000	1,220,000
Daily coal use (tons).....	9,500	3,300

While mentioning the economics of our plant, I would note for the committee, that the entire South Carolina congressional delegation—both Senate and House Members—support this legislation. The South Carolina General Assembly on February 8, 1962, adopted a concurrent resolution strongly supporting this project and memorializing the Congress to authorize its construction as soon as possible. In addition, the Governor of South Carolina and the South Carolina Development Board strongly support this bill.

#### NECESSITY FOR AND FUNCTION OF DAM

Steam-electric generating plants require large quantities of water for condensing steam. In connection with Duke Power's proposed plant, a diversion dam across the Savannah River is necessary to provide sufficient storage to reregulate the nonuniform flows to be discharged from Hartwell hydroplant. Our dam will be a relatively low structure. It is a retaining wall only and will not be used to generate hydroelectric power. The pond created by this diversion dam will have a surface area of only 1,500 acres.

To condense the steam, river water will be drawn from the pond created by the diversion dam and will be returned to the river downstream from the dam. In passing through the condensers, the water's temperature will be raised some 13° to 18° F., depending upon operating conditions. After discharge from the powerhouse, the warmer water will, under the most adverse weather conditions, be cooled by natural processes to normal temperature by the time it travels a relatively short distance downstream from the steamplant.

In addition, the diversion dam will act as a thermal barrier to separate the intake and discharge points of the plant's cooling water system. Without this barrier, if a

Government hydroelectric project is built in this stretch of the river, warm water discharged from the condensers would recirculate to the intake, be drawn into the plant, and reduce the plant's efficiency.

#### COMPARABILITY OF DUKE POWER'S PLANT WITH GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT

Several plans have been proposed for development of the stretch of the Savannah River between the Clark Hill and Hartwell projects. In 1959 the Army Engineers considered the construction of two projects, Carters Island and Goat Island. After re-study, the Army district engineer on February 9, 1962, recommended that a single project, Trotters Shoals, be built to impound the entire reach of the river between Clark Hill and Hartwell.

Duke has kept the Army Engineers advised of its plans for the Savannah River plant as they have developed, and has had numerous conferences with both the district engineer in Savannah and the division engineer in Atlanta.

If no Federal dam is built, Duke's proposed steam plant requires only a diversion dam with a crest at elevation 466 above mean sea level. However, in order to make its plant and the proposed Carters Island and Goat Island projects compatible, Duke advised the Army Engineers of its willingness to construct its diversion dam to elevation 475.

When Trotters Shoals was proposed, Duke again met with the Army Engineers and reiterated its agreement to construct its dam to elevation 475, which is the elevation recommended by the Army Engineers for Trotters Shoals. Although this additional height on the Duke Dam is not needed for its project, Duke will assume this additional cost to achieve compatibility between its plant and Trotters Shoals, should Congress authorize the construction of Trotters Shoals.

#### TIME SCHEDULE OF CONSTRUCTION

Duke Power Co.'s construction program calls for initial operation of the first unit of 350,000 kilowatts of the Savannah River plant about July 1, 1967, with the second unit to commence operation about 1 year later. Further units will be added as needed to meet system requirements up to a maximum plant capacity of about 2 million kilowatts.

To begin operation on July 1, 1967, construction of the dam and steamplant must begin approximately 3 years earlier, about July 1, 1964. Before construction of the dam and plant can proceed, a railroad must be built to the site to bring in the necessary construction materials. This plant site can be served by more than one railroad. Construction of the railroad must begin on either March 1, 1963, or January 1, 1964, depending upon what railroad connection shall be built.

#### ARMY ENGINEERS HAVE NO OBJECTION TO BILL

H.R. 6789 is patterned after Public Law 68, enacted by the 80th Congress, 1st session, May 16, 1947, authorizing Duke Power Co. to construct a diversion dam across the Dan River in Rockingham County, N.C. H.R. 6789 was submitted to the Chief of Engineers in Washington, D.C., and contains the only suggestion made by the Chief of Engineers, which was the insertion in line 21, page 2, of the words "or downstream."

By letter of August 24, 1961, the Department of the Army advised the House Committee on Public Works that it had no objection to the passage of this bill, saying in part:

"It is considered that the proposed Duke Power Co. dam would not materially affect future development of the water resources of the stream as planned. In any event, the interests of the United States are protected by the provision in the bill requiring approval of plans by the Chief of Engineers and Secretary of the Army with such conditions as they deem necessary and the provision releasing the United States from all claims for damages by reason of any Federal project upstream or downstream from the proposed dam."

"The Department of the Army interposes no objection to the enactment of H.R. 6789."

The bill grants Duke authority to construct its plant on condition that its plans are approved by the Army Engineers and prohibits variance from the plans so approved except with approval of the Army Engineers.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR VIEWS ON BILL

By letter of April 27, 1962, the Department of the Interior presented to the committee its views on H.R. 6789. The Department of the Interior has made what seems to us to be a very unusual request. It is that they be given authority to approve plans for our structure. Historically the approval of plans for structures in navigable streams of the United States has always rested with the Army Engineers. We have checked this matter through the office of Congressman DORN who introduced this bill. He advises us that he knows of no instance in which the Congress has granted to the Department of the Interior veto power over project plans. Congressman DORN further advises us that he made inquiry of the counsel to this committee and your counsel knew of no such grant of authority.

We respectfully point out that were we to be required to obtain approval of our plans from both the Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior, we would be placed in a most difficult position. Such dual approval would be quite time consuming and our time schedule is a tight one. But a much more serious problem stems from the fact that the Army Engineers and the Department of the Interior may be in disagreement as to the type of structure we should build. The Army Engineers' report on the



proposed Trotters Shoals Government dam calls for that project to be built to elevation 475 feet above mean sea level with no provision for pumped storage at Hartwell Dam. The Department of the Interior wants Trotters Shoals at 480 feet above mean sea level, with provision for pumped storage at Hartwell. These different views not only call for different heights for our structure, but a different design altogether. So long as this difference exists between the two agencies, if both must approve our plans, we are placed in an impossible situation. We respectfully urge this committee to leave the approval of plans for our project with the Army Engineers where this authority has heretofore resided.

#### FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION VIEWS ON BILL

By letter of May 18, 1962, the Federal Power Commission commented upon H.R. 6789 to the committee. H.R. 6789, as pending before the committee, contains a provision indemnifying the United States against damages to our structure by reason of any Federal development on the Savannah. This is the same form of indemnity clause enacted by the Congress in Public Law 68, 80th Congress, authorizing us to construct a similar dam for our Dan River plant in 1947. The Federal Power Commission, however, suggests an amendment which would give the Federal Power Commission or other authorized agencies power to require Duke Power Co. to remove its dam if it should ever interfere with any Federal development on the river. This to us seems a very harsh provision, especially when it is remembered that the Army Engineers have full control over the plans for our dam. To our knowledge, no such language has ever been enacted in an enabling act of the type we seek. The Federal Power Commission did not suggest such an amendment when it commented to the Congress upon our Dan River bill.

The Federal Power Commission's report to this committee cited legislation (61 Stat. 675) authorizing Pennsylvania Power & Light Co. to build a dam in the Susquehanna River as authority for the proposed FPC amendment to H.R. 6789. But that legislation was not authority for the proposed amendment because it did not require the removal of the Pennsylvania Power & Light dam.

It is doubtful that Duke Power Co. could borrow the millions of dollars we will need for our steamplant were the FPC amendment adopted. The bondholder's mortgage would be of little value against a steamplant which could be rendered useless by having its essential cooling-water dam destroyed.

It is no answer to say, as the FPC amendment suggests, that Duke Power Co. could utilize the reservoir which caused Duke's dam to be destroyed. We are sure that the committee can understand our fear of having a \$280 million plant located upon a reservoir over which we had absolutely no control. Such a reservoir might be drained for work on its dam or power facilities, leaving our steamplant without cooling water and, therefore, useless. In addition, the location of Duke's plant on the slack water of a reservoir after removal of Duke's dam would permit recirculation of the warm water discharged from the plant's condensers. This would substantially reduce both the efficiency and the capacity of Duke's steamplant.

When these factors are considered, we believe the committee will understand why we cannot undertake this project if the condition contained in the FPC amendment is imposed.

We would like to leave with the committee a memorandum covering the requested Federal Power Commission amendment. We urge the committee to conclude that this is a burdensome and unnecessary amendment, and that the indemnity clause contained in H.R. 6789, and previously enacted by the

Congress in 1947 for our Dan River plant, is satisfactory.

#### WHY A DUKE POWERPLANT ON THE SAVANNAH RIVER?

Duke Power Co. has for many years planned the eventual location of one or more major generating plants on the Savannah River, and long ago purchased substantial areas of land on the river for this purpose. Over 2,200 acres of the company's land was condemned for the Clark Hill Federal project, and over 3,600 acres for the Hartwell project. On land remaining which it owns on the Savannah, the company now proposes constructing the above-mentioned steamplant. We own substantially all of the land necessary for our steamplant and its cooling water reservoir.

Duke's entire area is served by an integrated system of high-voltage transmission lines. The company is now in the process of completing a 230,000-volt trunk transmission line system throughout the area. Generation at any one point on the system is fed into this interconnecting transmission network and becomes a part of the combined total production which is used to supply the area. Generation by Duke on the Savannah River would be fed into this interconnecting transmission system. In addition, it should be noted that our system will be interconnected with that of Georgia Power Co., and the generation from our Savannah River plant will also be a valuable backup to that company.

The southwestern part of the company's service area which is bounded by the Savannah River has been undergoing rapid industrial and population growth. This area includes Anderson and Greenville, S.C. Present annual energy requirements within the area are about 5.1 billion kilowatt-hours, and it is expected that by 1970 the requirement of the area will have doubled. Obviously, it is desirable that additional generating facilities be provided in this vicinity.

There is no other river in the southwestern portion of the Duke area having a streamflow sufficient to provide cooling water for the 2 million kilowatt steamplant Duke proposes for this area.

#### SUMMARY

In summary, Duke Power Co. calls special attention to the following aspects of its proposed plant:

1. The projected growth of the company's service area demands the location of a large steamplant in the lower end of its system, and the Savannah River is the only stream capable of providing cooling water adequate for the size of the plant required in this portion of Duke's service area.

2. The proposed plant will be of tremendous economic benefit to the area, both in construction and operation. It will provide jobs for many during construction and a large annual payroll for operation; it will consume approximately 3.5 million tons of coal per year; it will produce a substantial volume of taxes for both Federal and local governments; and it will generate the large quantities of firm electric power which will be needed for the industrial development of the region. (This plant will support the system of Georgia Power Co., as well as Duke Power Co., through interconnections between the two companies.)

3. The proposed plant will not prevent the construction of the Trotters Shoals project presently proposed by the Army Engineers, should Congress decide to authorize it. For the purpose of avoiding conflict between the two projects, Duke Power Co. will be spending substantially more than its project would otherwise cost.

4. The entire South Carolina congressional delegation supports Duke's plant and H.R. 6789.

5. The plans for our plant must be approved in detail by the Army Engineers, who have traditionally controlled structures in

navigable streams. The granting of similar approval authority to the Department of the Interior is not necessary and would seriously delay, if not prevent, construction of Duke's plant.

6. The Federal Power Commission's suggested amendment requiring Duke to remove its dam under certain conditions is not necessary, has not been enacted heretofore, and would prevent construction of this plant.

We urge the committee to give H.R. 6789 a favorable report in its present form which has been approved by the Army Engineers.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, for the record it should be said that the chairman [Mr. KERR] of the conference committee on the part of the Senate has indicated that there was an agreement by the managers on the part of the House that the hearings on the eight projects which have been spelled out here today would be held early next year, possibly beginning in January. I think it is important to indicate that the Senator from Oklahoma requested this action on the part of the Public Works Committee in the House. That was not initiated by the managers on the part of the House, but came from the Senate request.

I believe it is factual to state to Senators who have an intense interest in certain projects that this was the desire and determination expressed by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], the chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate. Others of us were privileged to work with him, to insist that the House hearings be held early next year. That was the agreement entered into after the initiative was taken by the Senator from Oklahoma.

There were 13 days of hearings in the Senate Subcommittee on Flood Control—Rivers and Harbors and approximately 100 hours of testimony was heard. Thorough consideration was given to these projects representing all sections of the country. There are 17 members of the Committee on Public Works chaired by the experienced and effective Senator CHAVEZ. Our subcommittee consisted of the following: ROBERT S. KERR, chairman; PAT McNAMARA, JENNINGS RANDOLPH, STEPHEN M. YOUNG, EDMUND S. MUSKIE, FRANK E. MOSS, OREN E. LONG, BENJAMIN A. SMITH II, LEE METCALF, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, HIRAM L. FONG, J. CALEB BOGGS, JACK R. MILLER, MAURICE J. MURPHY, Jr., and JAMES B. PEARSON.

Several of these men presided over hearings lasting 8 hours or longer. They were patient and helpful in moving the projects ahead, with the assistance of the committee staff, and witnesses.

It is timely also to stress that often, and mistakenly, such projects—almost 200 involved in this legislation—are referred to as "pork barrel" items. That is a misnomer. The citizens of our country should realize rather than pork barrel projects, that these are projects definitely in the public interest. They contribute to the national wealth, and strengthen the economic base of the country. They are dividend producing projects.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. KERR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion of the conference report. I know something of the task involved in bringing about the settlement.

I have no interest individually in those projects which have been left out. I mean that they do not affect my State. I am interested, of course, as a citizen and as a Member of the U.S. Senate.

There is something which I think is a little ominous contained in the statement that the House conferees would not accept the projects because the House had not been able to hold hearings on the projects, and that therefore they were eliminated. It is true that we have been given a promise of early hearings next year.

My question is, are we moving gradually but surely into a position in which the Senate cannot initiate portions of legislation, based upon hearings the Senate holds? For instance, my understanding is that with respect to many of these projects, and perhaps all of them, the budget estimates were sent to Capitol Hill after the bill had passed the House, that those were before the Senate, and that the projects had been cleared.

Is the Senate to be barred from any initiative in legislative matters? Goodness knows, an apparent effort has been made to bar the Senate on appropriation matters from adding new items, and from taking an initiative on its own part. Is that to be extended to the legislative field? If so, I am concerned.

I know that often, in the legislative committees of which I am a member, new matters are considered by the committees. Sometimes the Senate committees initiate and the Senate passes legislation which goes to the other body, and the committee in the other body adds new material to the proposed legislation after hearings held there. Does that mean we have a right to object to that process, because the Senate has not held hearings?

My answer to the question, of course, is in the negative. By the same token, I do not believe that the House of Representatives has the right to say that the Senate cannot add projects to legislation already passed by the House simply because the House has not held hearings on those particular projects.

I wish to lodge one protest against any such understanding as that, and I think the RECORD ought to show clearly that it is not our intention that that should become a precedent which would rule in the future.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the

motion to lay on the table the motion to reconsider.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, with reference to the remarks by the distinguished Senator from Alabama, for which I am grateful, because they call to mind a matter about which considerable has been said and much more thought, I wish to say that the Senate added to the bill about 44 projects or items relating to projects. There were some three projects added in the action by the Senate. Of these thus added by the Senate, about 37 were kept in conference. Therefore, I say to my good friend that the Senate had a good deal to say about what went into the bill.

In addition, we added provisions in the bill concerning a new method of approach on beach erosion. We added a new method of approach on implementation of recreation. A very significant provision was added by the Senate Committee on Public Works in connection with the handling by the Bureau of Reclamation of the replacement of highways in multiple-purpose projects or water resources projects.

The distinguished Senator will remember that in 1960, the Senate added provisions to the omnibus rivers and harbors and flood control bill which allows a new formula for the Corps of Engineers as to the replacement of highways in multiple-purpose projects and water retention reservoirs. Under previous procedures, which was more administrative than legislative, the Corps of Engineers, in the replacement of highway facilities, would allow only enough money to replace the existing highway facility in kind; that is, to the same specifications as the existing roads.

We all know that these reservoirs are built in areas where sometimes the highways are 10, 15, 20, 30, and 40 years old. When these roads were built, they were built in accordance with the standards of those days and more adequate to accommodate traffic of those days. But in 1960 we provided that the Corps of Engineers could pay the cost of their building of the new highways so that they would be of standards adequate to accommodate present day traffic needs. Through an oversight we did not make that rule applicable to the roads replaced by the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with reclamation projects. That situation was corrected in the bill, and the same provision added for that Bureau. There were additional provisions which related to emergency flood control work small flood control projects and measures which will be of great help in developing our water resources projects. I wish to pay special tribute to our great chairman, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], who provided so much leadership in the development of the proposed legislation, and the wonderful staff of the committee, which spent many weeks preparing for hearings and assisting in the 13 days of hearings that the Public Works Committee had on the proposed legislation.

I pay special tribute to the members of the committee who worked, in the busiest time of the present session, long

hours of the day, including Saturdays, to get the bill ready to bring to the Senate; and to Senators who served on the conference with the Senator from Oklahoma, including the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG]. Their service was faithful, devoted, and of great help and benefit.

In connection with the hearings, the present Presiding Officer [Mr. METCALF in the chair] spent many days in conducting the hearings, as did also the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to the chairman of the House Rules Committee—a very great, honorable, and highly respected gentleman.

The proposed legislation passed the House and then the Senate very late in the session, with certain differences. The measure went back to the House. It was apparent that if we were to accommodate our differences and have a bill, a conference would be necessary.

The Senator from Oklahoma made the statement about the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee and about the Senator from Oklahoma that they were a couple of tough and rugged characters. They were stubborn and of very positive convictions and thinking. But I respect stubbornness. I respect positive convictions. The distinguished Representative from Virginia, Mr. HOWARD SMITH, is one of the great public servants of this period in our history. I hope he lives long and continues in the service of his country.

I do not agree with him on a number of things. By the same token, he does not agree with me on a number of things.

Such differences do not reduce my respect—indeed, my esteem and affection—for him. But I wish to remind Senators that due to the amount of influence or the position that the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee has, he could have, for a considerable number of days, either prevented a rule being given that could result in a conference or certainly create delay. But he agreed to the Rules Committee giving a rule and, as Senators know, after that was done he could have put it in his pocket for 10 days if he had wanted to. Determined as he was to bring about certain results, he still recognized the propriety and the wisdom of permitting the legislative process to have its way and in having a conference.

The Senator from Oklahoma does not blame him for having called the House conferees in before he gave that rule and asked them if they would stand firm in reference to certain projects in the bill. If the Senator from Oklahoma had had the positive convictions that the chairman of the Rules Committee did about these things, he probably would have tried in some way—which perhaps would not have been as apparent or as highly publicized—to have gained his objective. But if the Senator from Oklahoma had felt positive enough about it and had arrived at the conclusion that



the only way to accomplish his objective was the way in which the distinguished Representative from Virginia did it, he might have done the same thing.

But I wish to say to his credit that he made it possible this week for us to have a conference, which ended yesterday.

I see by my calendar that yesterday was Friday, October 12, which was an historic day, Mr. President. It was the anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus. That was a more important event than a successful determination of the conference. But I wish to say that the conference termination and accomplishment was of great significance and enhanced Columbus Day. It certainly did nothing to cast any eclipse or darkness upon it.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am deeply indebted, as I believe the Senate is, to the chairman of the committee, the members of the staff, the House conferees, the leadership of the House and the Senate, and to the great Representative from Virginia, Judge HOWARD SMITH.

#### PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 12900) making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of October 12, 1962, p. 23424, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as everyone knows, the bill was handled in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. I present the report due to the fact that the Senator from Louisiana is necessarily absent today. The conference report was signed by all the conferees of the Senate who participated in the conference.

At the conclusion of the conference, our chairman, the Senator from Louisiana, stated that he felt that, considering the bill as a whole, the Senate had fared very well in our conference with the House. With respect to general investigations, the conference figure of \$17,870,300 is \$1,308,400 over the amount approved by the House, and \$1,322,000 under the Senate figure. I believe, with one or two exceptions that were taken care of this afternoon in the other body, the Senate conferees did very well in maintaining a large number of the proj-

ects which the Senate provided for during the consideration of the bill.

The Senate added 21 new starts under "Construction, general." In the floor action in the other body, to which I referred a moment ago, two additional new construction starts, previously approved by the Senate, were restored to the bill. The bill, therefore, provides for 18 out of the 21 new starts added by the Senate.

It is unnecessary to say that the Senate conferees, especially our distinguished chairman, the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] would personally have liked to have seen all of the Senate amendments saved in the conference.

I might say that our chairman and the members of the conference committee—but particularly the chairman, who has more familiarity with the bill than any other individual in Congress—waged a very valiant fight in conference to save these projects.

Generally speaking, the House sent us a good bill this year. As you will recall, for the past few years the House has inserted some new unbudgeted construction projects. This year's projects, on examination by the Senate committee, proved to be desirable, and the committee approved their inclusion, as we have done with similar projects in years past.

In a few minutes I intend to move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 2. Senators will recall that when the supplemental appropriation bill was before the Senate, certain items were inserted in the bill which had not been agreed to in the conference report on the bill.

One item under "Construction, general," was in actual disagreement. That is the item which pertains to a budgeted item of \$205,000 for the completion of planning on the Cross Florida Barge Canal. The House did not approve the item originally. It had a budget estimate and was inserted in the bill by the Senate.

The chairman of the House conferees moved that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 2, and agree to the same. That amendment would have made the general construction figure \$791,585,000.

That motion was defeated by a rollcall vote in the House. A substitute motion, which was next in order under the Rules of the House, was then made by Representative SIKES, of Florida, to provide \$792,845,500. This would include all the funds contemplated in the motion offered by the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee, plus the following items:

The item in disagreement, which was the Cross Florida Barge Canal, for which the budgeted amount is \$205,000, to complete the planning for the project. The next item was Calumet Harbor and River development in Indiana and Illinois, \$110,000. Kaskaskia River, in Illinois, \$100,000. Then the Columbia and Lower Willamette Rivers below Vancouver, Wash., and Portland, Oreg., \$100,000. The Blue River Reservoir, Oreg., \$500,000. The Yaquina Bay and Harbor project, Oregon, \$200,000. Also \$50,000 to initiate planning on the Port

Arthur Bridge over the Sabine Neches Waterway, Tex.

The total amount involved in the so-called Sikes motion was an increase of \$1,265,000. This amount was agreed to by a voice vote. The total construction item was, therefore, increased by that amount. That means that the amount, as it comes before us now, is \$792,845,500.

Therefore, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report. That will leave in disagreement the amendment to which I have referred.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. In the supplemental appropriation bill there is contained an item of \$1,450,000 for the Navajo Reservation Irrigation District. What happened to that project?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that item is still in the supplemental appropriation bill. Objection was made to laying down the bill before the other body, and the House has not considered the request of the Senate for a conference on that bill. The item is included in the supplemental bill. The other body, however, so far has not permitted the bill to go to conference. As the Senator knows, the Senate Committee on Appropriations approved that project.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is right.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that it has not been laid down in the other body, but that is a matter which is wholly beyond the control of this humble servant.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, let me give just one example of the effect of not acting on the supplemental appropriation bill. Contained in the supplemental appropriation bill is a provision for payment of \$30 million to the civil service retirement and disability fund to finance the annuity benefits and increases provided for in the Postal Service and Federal Employees Salary Act. This is one of the measures the President frequently refers to in listing the achievements of this Congress. Yet unless this \$30 million payment is made, this provision of the act will be completely ineffective. It will be a hoax and anyone expecting an increase will be bitterly disappointed. This is a performance that can only be called shameful.

The argument will be made that the funds can be appropriated next year. But what guarantee is there that the same squabbling which has prevented action now would not prevent action next year? And if this increase is justified, why should the beneficiaries have to wait months before it is paid? There are no satisfactory answers to these questions. We will simply be breaking faith with those who thought that starting in January 1963, they would be getting the increase they were promised and deserve under this legislation.

We must take steps early in the next Congress to reform the procedures of the House and Senate. The appropriation process we are now following has broken down. There are simply too many opportunities for obstruction under the

present system, and these opportunities have been fully exploited. The wasted motion, the duplication, the attitude of rule or ruin, has made it impossible for Congress to act on the fiscal problems of our Nation in any orderly or sensible way. This is causing tremendous difficulties in the operations of the Government. It produces results which are very unfair to individual members and States. It sounds silly to talk about inefficiency in the executive branch of the Government when we consider the dismal failure of our own procedures for dealing with appropriations.

It is incredible to realize that all of these appropriations will have to be considered again when we reconvene in January. The same hassles and bickering will resume with hardly any interruption in just over 2 months. The mere prospect of a repeat performance of what we have been through this session is painful to contemplate.

I hope it will not be considered presumptuous to make some proposals for reform in appropriation procedures. One is that we have 2-year appropriations so that Congress can spend some of its valuable time on other than fiscal issues. Many State legislatures do this and the result would certainly be to save money as well as time.

Another is for the appropriation committees to begin their work before Congress convenes so that we do not waste months at the beginning of every session waiting for bills to come out of committee. Another is to combine Senate and House appropriation hearings and staffs, still reserving to each body the power of independent decision.

We should have an appropriation's timetable for Congress and make the consideration of appropriation bills automatic so that they are not imperiled by procedural objections of individual members and a veto power by the Rules Committee of the other body.

These are commonsense procedures which it would seem any objective observer would favor. The prerogatives and privileges of a few Members cannot be allowed to stand in the way of their consideration if the Congress is to do its work in a manner deserving of public support.

Rules reform must be a matter of the highest priority in the next session of Congress.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 12900, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, U.S.,

October 13, 1962.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 4, 13, and 18 to the bill (H.R. 12900) entitled "An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Saint Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes", and concur therein.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "\$792,845,500".

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a summary and other tables showing how the money is distributed among the various titles of the bill be placed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment No. 2, with an amendment as follows: Strike out "\$792,845,500" and insert "\$793,060,000".

This is a total of \$215,000 more than the House figure. It includes \$115,000 for the deepwater harbor project at Kaunakakai, Hawaii, which was included in the Senate version of the public works appropriation bill. Authorization for this project was approved by both the House and the Senate in the omnibus public works bill to which conferees have agreed. Earlier today the House approved the conference report and the Senate has just given its approval. The remaining \$100,000 provided in my amendment is for a flood control project at Ansonia-Derby, Conn. This project, too, was contained in the public works appropriation bill as passed by the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that a description of the two projects, the one in Hawaii, and the other in Connecticut, may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### KAUNAKAKAI HARBOR, MOLOKAI, HAWAII

The island of Molokai is about 40 miles from this principal island of Oahu, where Honolulu is located and where more than 500,000 of Hawaii's 690,000 population live. The harbor of Kaunakakai is about 60 miles from Honolulu Harbor.

The main industry on Molokai is agriculture, chiefly a cash crop, pineapple. At present, the fresh pineapples are transported by barge to Honolulu where the fruit is processed in Oahu canneries. Until now, agricultural growth on Molokai has been severely hampered by lack of water in central and western Molokai. Underway, however, is a small reclamation project which will render arable 14,600 acres on Molokai, thereby greatly increasing pineapple production.

The early completion of the irrigation project and the imminent construction of pineapple canneries require that the Kaunakakai deepwater harbor project get underway as soon as possible. Then export commodities can be directly shipped from Molokai in large vessels, avoiding the costs of transshipment in Honolulu. This will be more practical, efficient, and economical than shipping Molokai commodities by barge or small ship to Oahu and then unloading and reloading cargoes for export.

The project has the approval of the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of the Budget. The House has approved its authorization. The Senate has approved its authorization. There is no controversy over its authorization. It has an excellent benefit-cost ratio—4.4 to 1.

#### NAUGATUCK RIVER, ANSONIA-DERBY, CONN.—JUSTIFICATION

(H. Doc. No. 437, 87th Cong.)

Location: The city of Ansonia and the town of Derby are adjoining communities located in southern Connecticut on the Naugatuck River about 12 miles above Long Island Sound.

Authority: A resolution of the Public Works Committee of the U.S. Senate adopted September 14, 1955, and similar resolutions of the Public Works Committee of the House of Representatives of the United States adopted June 13 and 23, 1956, respectively.

Existing project: Federal flood-control improvements in the basin affecting Ansonia-Derby consist of seven reservoirs for flood control, authorized by Congress. One reservoir, Thomaston, is located at mile 30 on the main stream and has been in operation for flood control since September 1960. None of the other reservoirs are under construction.

Flood problem: Flooding of the Naugatuck River causes damages to residential, commercial, industrial, and other properties located in Ansonia-Derby, and creates health, safety, and economic problems which adversely affect the welfare of the cities.

Recommended plan of improvement: Provides for approximately 12,470 linear feet of levee and floodwall, with appurtenant works, for the protection of approximately 232 acres of industrial, commercial, and residential areas in Ansonia-Derby.

Estimated cost (price level of January 1960)

Federal.....	\$5,620,000
Non-Federal.....	380,000

Total..... 6,000,000

#### Project economics

	Federal	Non-Federal	Total
Annual charges:			
Interest and amortization.....	\$208,900	\$15,200	\$224,100
Maintenance and operation.....	0	10,700	10,700
Net loss of productivity.....	0	2,300	2,300
Total.....	208,900	28,200	237,100

#### Annual benefits

Damages prevented.....	\$206,000
Enhancement from reduction of flood hazard.....	84,000

Total..... 290,000

Benefit-cost ratio: 1.2.

Local cooperation: (a) Contribute in cash because of the more costly plan desired by local interests for the River Street area, 1.4 percent of the construction cost, presently estimated at \$80,000, to be paid either in a lump sum prior to start of construction or in installments prior to start of pertinent work items, in accordance with construction schedules as required by the Chief of Engineers, the final contribution to be determined after actual costs are known; (b) provide without cost to the United States all land easements, and rights-of-way necessary for construction of the project, including changes to highway bridges and roads, railroad track, sewers, and other utilities; (c) hold and save the United States free from damages due to the construction works; (d) maintain and operate all the works after completion in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Army; and (e) prevent encroachment on the improved channels or on the ponding areas, and if capacities are impaired, provide equivalent effective storage or pumping capacity without cost to the United States. Local interests are willing to furnish the items of local cooperation.



Comments of the State and Federal agencies:  
 Department of the Interior: Favorable.  
 Department of Commerce: Favorable.  
 Department of Agriculture: Favorable.  
 State of Connecticut: Favorable.  
 Comments of the Bureau of the Budget:  
 No objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am somewhat familiar with the details of the projects that are included in this item, although I did not have primary responsibility in connection with the conference report. I certainly hope that the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts will carefully consider the possible consequences of amending the Senate amendment at this late date. I am sure the majority leader would like to make a statement, because Members on both sides have worked incessantly in trying to bring this measure to this stage. It would be unfortunate if we lost it after all this work had been done on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wish to join in the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and to add my request to him; namely, that in view of the difficult circumstances in which we find ourselves at present, the Senator from Massachusetts will not press his amendment, which is a good amendment, and had been offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH] and the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], and which, I believe, was approved unanimously by this body.

I assure the Senator from Massachusetts that one of the first orders of business next January will be the consideration of these proposals and one other which had been approved by the Senate. I hope that with that assurance the acting minority leader will reconsider the offering of the amendment which is now pending and will withdraw it on the basis of the promise being made by the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I was authorized by the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who handled the supplemental appropriation bill, to state for him that next year he will be glad to see to it that these items are given the most sympathetic attention in the first supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by Congress, and that if he has anything to do with that bill, he will include these projects.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the statements of the two distinguished leaders on the other side of the aisle. The subject was discussed at considerable length in a private conference. I realize the problem in relation to the House with respect to these specific situations, especially the supplemental appropriation bill for this year.

The Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Hawaii are unavoidably detained at this hour because of official business. At their request, I agreed to offer the amendments.

I discussed the two amendments with the majority leader and the Senator from Georgia, and they assured me that

they would discuss the matter on the floor. On the basis of the character, integrity, and leadership of these two distinguished Senators, and on my own assurance as a member of the Committee on Appropriations that we will do everything we can to include these items in the first supplemental appropriation bill of the 88th Congress, I therefore withdraw the amendment.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, one of the items deleted from this appropriation bill by the House-Senate conference was an appropriation of \$100,000 for advance engineering and design of the Booneville Reservoir in the Kentucky River Basin. It was added in the Senate upon my motion and that of my colleague from Kentucky [Mr. MORTON].

In 1954, former Senator Clements and I submitted a resolution asking for a survey of the Kentucky River Valley Basin and all its tributaries. I believe the records of the Corps of Engineers show that for more than 100 years the Kentucky River Valley extending from Virginia to the Ohio River has been swept and ravaged by floods. After the tragic flooding of the Kentucky in 1957, I introduced a resolution in the Public Works Committee, asking that the Corps of Engineers expedite its survey, and this was done.

In 1960, the Corps of Engineers, after years of intensive work presented its plan for the comprehensive flood protection of the Kentucky River Valley. The plan called for the construction of four reservoirs—Booneville, Carrs Fork, Eagle Creek, and Red River—and local protection at Frankfort, the capital of Kentucky, which is flooded almost every year. The annual flood damage in the valley has reached to almost \$10 million in several years. As Carrs Fork, Eagle Creek, and Red River reservoirs were not authorized until today—only Booneville—authorized in 1944—was eligible for appropriations.

The proposal which I offered with Senator MORTON was a request for an initial appropriation for advance engineering and design, preparatory to actual construction.

This item is one of three which was stricken from the bill. I have spoken to the majority leader about this appropriation and I now address myself to my friend, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the member of the Committee on Appropriations who is in charge of the bill. I express the hope that next year the Committee on Appropriations will provide funds for Booneville Reservoir in an early supplemental appropriation bill, or the regular works appropriation bill. I know that if that is done, the Senate conferees will make every effort to insist that it be maintained in conference with the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that the assurance which I gave on behalf of the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and at his express suggestion, included the project about which the Senator from Kentucky has just spoken. I thought I so stated at the time I made my statement with respect to the amend-

ment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. The Senator from Florida said he would be happy to undertake to promote this planning project in the first supplemental appropriation bill to be brought before the Senate in 1963.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I fully corroborate the statement just made by the Senator from Georgia. I make the same promise to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I accept without any reservation whatever the statements of the majority leader, and the assurance the Senator from Georgia has given for the Senator from Florida.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement with respect to two Oregon projects which were included in the supplemental appropriation bill, but were not included in the final public works bill report now offered by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

The first is with respect to the Mason Dam project, at Baker, Oreg., calling for \$145,000 of planning money. The other is for a \$20,000 project at Pendleton, Oreg. Both are reclamation projects.

I attended the conference of Senate managers of this bill to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] just referred; at that conference we discussed all phases of the parliamentary problems which confronts us with respect to the conference report on public works items. At that conference, it was pointed out that these two Oregon reclamation projects could have been made subject to points of order by the House. Therefore, there could have been no assurance whatsoever that they could be obtained at this session no matter how long we stayed here. But we also recognized at that conference that, come January, the senior Senator from Oregon would be in a position to press for the consideration of these projects in connection with a supplemental appropriation bill. The senior Senator from Oregon was given the assurance of his colleagues that they would do what they could to assist in presenting the requests for those two projects to the Senate, so that the projects could be included in the supplemental appropriation bill to be considered by the Senate in January. Therefore, the RECORD should show that although I think it is unfortunate that these very much needed projects in eastern Oregon will have to wait for a few months, nevertheless the rules of the House after all, were applicable to them, and I reluctantly went along with that arrangement.

I express my sincere appreciation for the cooperation of Senators who are in charge of the bill and also for the cooperation I received from Members of the House, from whom I received a large number of messages in the past 2 days in reference to the Oregon items. The three which were included are job-producing projects in my State in which a serious employment depression now exists. By including them in this final conference report a great many things were accomplished, not the least of which was the clear and salutary demonstration by both Houses of Congress that there

would be a maintenance of the purity of the legislative process in the Congress.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as the Senator from Oregon has just stated, the two projects he has described are in the same unfortunate position as the Navajo project, advocated by the Senator from New Mexico. But in this report there was no item to which these projects could have been appended; and it would have made the whole report sub-

ject to a point of order if the reclamation projects had been added to a river and harbor item.

In view of the multiplicity of difficulties the bill has encountered in the past few days, I think the Senate has done quite well to have salvaged this much of the items which were included in the supplemental bill.

Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House

to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the action it has taken on that amendment.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXHIBIT 1  
Summary table

	Estimates, 1963	Amount allowed by the House	Amount allowed by the Senate	Conference allowance
<b>TITLE I</b>				
<b>CIVIL FUNCTIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY</b>				
Quartermaster Corps, cemetery expenses.....	\$10,276,000	\$10,276,000	\$10,276,000	\$10,276,000
Corps of Engineers:				
General investigations.....	<sup>1</sup> 17,265,000	16,561,900	19,192,300	17,870,300
Construction.....	<sup>2</sup> 780,645,000	762,361,000	807,962,500	792,845,500
Operation and maintenance.....	143,539,000	143,539,000	143,539,000	143,539,000
General expenses.....	13,600,000	13,580,000	13,580,000	13,580,000
Mississippi River and tributaries.....	70,500,000	70,500,000	75,954,000	73,504,000
St. Lawrence Joint Board of Engineers.....	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
International Navigational Congresses.....				
Total, Corps of Engineers.....	1,025,569,000	1,006,561,900	1,060,247,800	1,041,358,800
Panama Canal:				
Canal Zone Government:				
Operating expenses.....	<sup>3</sup> 22,772,000	22,772,000	22,772,000	22,772,000
Capital outlay.....	3,120,000	3,120,000	3,120,000	3,120,000
General and administrative expenses.....	(8,113,000)	(8,113,000)	(8,113,000)	(8,113,000)
Total, Canal Zone Government.....	25,892,000	25,892,000	25,892,000	25,892,000
Total, title I.....	1,061,737,000	1,042,729,900	1,086,415,800	1,077,526,800
<b>TITLE II</b>				
<b>DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR</b>				
Bureau of Reclamation:				
General investigations.....	8,400,000	7,100,000	9,420,000	8,400,000
General investigations (special foreign currency program).....	2,500,000			
Construction and rehabilitation.....	<sup>4</sup> 161,700,000	153,077,000	160,361,000	158,218,000
Operation and maintenance.....	38,250,000	38,150,000	36,444,600	36,444,600
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(3,543,000)	(3,543,000)	(3,543,000)	(3,543,000)
Loan program.....	<sup>5</sup> 12,517,000	10,173,000	12,517,000	12,517,000
Emergency fund.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
Upper Colorado River Basin fund.....	<sup>6</sup> 110,326,000	106,508,000	109,576,000	107,808,000
General administrative expenses.....	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000	9,300,000
Total, Bureau of Reclamation.....	343,993,000	325,308,000	338,618,600	333,687,600
Bonneville Power Administration:				
Construction.....	<sup>7</sup> 31,900,000	29,800,000	29,800,000	29,800,000
Operation and maintenance.....	12,750,000	12,713,000	12,713,000	12,713,000
Total, Bonneville Power Administration.....	44,650,000	42,513,000	42,513,000	42,513,000
Office of the Secretary, Southeastern Power Administration, operation and maintenance.....	800,000	800,000	800,000	800,000
Southwestern Power Administration:				
Construction.....	7,210,000	7,210,000	7,210,000	7,210,000
Operation and maintenance.....	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000	1,450,000
Continuing fund.....	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)	(5,000,000)
Total, Southwestern Power Administration.....	8,660,000	8,660,000	8,660,000	8,660,000
Total, definite appropriations.....	398,103,000	377,281,000	390,591,600	385,660,600
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	8,543,000	8,543,000	8,543,000	8,543,000
Total, title II.....	406,646,000	385,824,000	399,134,600	394,203,600
<b>TITLE III</b>				
<b>INDEPENDENT OFFICES</b>				
Atomic Energy Commission:				
Operating expenses.....	<sup>8</sup> 2,888,588,000	2,860,974,000	2,885,391,000	2,872,224,000
Indefinite appropriation of receipts.....	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)	(26,700,000)
Plant acquisition and construction.....	<sup>9</sup> 332,345,000	161,845,000	267,895,000	262,745,000
Total, Atomic Energy Commission.....	3,220,933,000	3,122,819,000	3,153,286,000	3,134,969,000
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation limitation on administrative expenses.....	(425,000)	(425,000)	(414,000)	(414,000)
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	35,071,000	35,071,000	35,071,000	35,071,000
Delaware River Basin Commission, salaries and expenses.....	32,000	32,000	32,000	32,000
Contribution to the Delaware River Basin Commission.....	<sup>10</sup> 80,000	80,000	80,000	80,000
Total, Delaware River Basin Commission.....	112,000	112,000	112,000	112,000
River Basin Study Commission for South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Florida, salaries and expenses.....	552,000	552,000	552,000	552,000
River Basin Study Commission for Texas, salaries and expenses.....	(11)	(11)	(11)	(11)
Total, definite appropriations.....	3,256,668,000	3,158,554,000	3,189,021,000	3,170,704,000
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000	26,700,000
Total, title III.....	3,283,368,000	3,185,254,000	3,215,721,000	3,197,404,000

See footnotes at end of table.



## EXHIBIT 1—Continued

## Summary table—Continued

	Estimates, 1963	Amount allowed by the House	Amount allowed by the Senate	Conference allowance
<b>TITLE IV</b>				
<b>FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT</b>				
Public works acceleration.....	\$900,000,000		\$500,000,000	\$400,000,000
Total, title IV.....	900,000,000		500,000,000	400,000,000
Grand totals:				
Total, definite appropriations.....	5,616,508,000	\$4,578,564,900	5,176,028,400	5,033,891,400
Total, indefinite appropriations.....	35,243,000	35,243,000	35,243,000	35,243,000
Grand total, all titles.....	5,651,751,000	4,613,807,900	5,211,271,400	5,069,134,400

<sup>1</sup> Includes increase of \$665,000 in H. Doc. No. 379.<sup>2</sup> Reflects decrease of \$930,000 in H. Doc. No. 379, and an increase of \$2,869,000 in H. Doc. No. 477, and an increase of \$3,000,000 in S. Doc. No. 135.<sup>3</sup> Includes increase of \$198,000 in H. Doc. No. 486.<sup>4</sup> Includes increase of \$750,000 in H. Doc. No. 422, and \$1,075,000 in H. Doc. No.<sup>5</sup> Includes budget amendment increases as follows: H. Doc. No. 388, \$800,000; H. Doc. No. 422, \$4,023,000; H. Doc. No. 431, \$750,000; and \$2,344,000 in S. Doc. No. 134.<sup>6</sup> Reflects decrease of \$6,884,000 in H. Doc. No. 422, and an increase of \$550,000 in H. Doc. No. 477.<sup>7</sup> Reflects decrease of \$3,000,000 in H. Doc. No. 388.<sup>8</sup> Reflects increase of \$164,500,000 in H. Doc. No. 409 and an increase of \$23,300,000 in H. Doc. No. 467.<sup>9</sup> Reflects increase of \$46,300,000 in H. Doc. No. 409.<sup>10</sup> Submitted in H. Doc. No. 393.<sup>11</sup> H. Doc. No. 393 and bill provide continuing availability of 1962 appropriation until Aug. 31, 1962.<sup>12</sup> In S. Doc. No. 129.

## General investigations, Corp of Engineers

Item (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963 (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
<b>GENERAL INVESTIGATIONS</b>				
<b>1. Surveys:</b>				
(a) Navigation studies.....	\$1,600,000	\$1,818,600	\$2,265,400	\$2,051,600
(b) Flood control studies.....	4,600,000	4,925,500	5,896,900	5,428,700
(c) Beach erosion cooperative studies.....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(d) Special studies:				
(1) San Francisco Bay survey.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(2) Ohio River Basin review.....	600,000	500,000	600,000	500,000
(3) Potomac River review.....	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
(4) Colorado River, Tex.....	228,000	228,000	228,000	228,000
(5) Great Lakes water levels.....	85,000	85,000	110,000	110,000
(6) Rampart Canyon, Alaska.....	315,000	315,000	415,000	415,000
(7) Arkansas-Red River pollution study.....	177,000	177,000	227,000	227,000
(8) Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal.....	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
(9) Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(10) Lake Erie-Ontario Waterway, N.Y.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(11) Susquehanna River Basin.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(12) Jersey Meadows, N.Y. and N.J.....	150,000	150,000	150,000	150,000
(13) Red River, La., Ark., Okla., and Tex.....	250,000	250,000	300,000	300,000
(14) Meramec River Basin, Mo.....	215,000	215,000	215,000	215,000
(15) Pascagoula River Basin, Miss.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(16) Willamette River Basin, Oreg.....	100,000	100,000	200,000	100,000
(17) Grand River Basin, Mich.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(18) Connecticut River Basin.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(19) Upper Mississippi River Basin.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(20) White River Basin, Ark. and Mo.....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(21) Brazos River Basin, Tex.....	100,000	140,000	140,000	140,000
(22) Great Lakes Harbors survey.....				
(23) Hudson River siltation study.....				
(24) Trinity River, Tex.....				
(25) Hurricane studies.....	945,000	945,000	945,000	945,000
(26) Coordination studies with other agencies.....	300,000	300,000	300,000	300,000
(27) Basin planning.....	400,000			
(28) Kanawha River Basin, W. Va.....			200,000	200,000
(29) Lake Champlain Waterway, N.Y. and Vt.....			50,000	
Subtotal, surveys.....	12,110,000	12,194,100	14,287,300	13,255,300
<b>2. Collection and study of basic data:</b>				
(a) Stream gaging (U.S. Geological Survey).....	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000
(b) Precipitation studies (U.S. Weather Bureau).....	380,000	380,000	380,000	380,000
(c) Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service).....	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
(d) International water studies.....	85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000
(e) Flood plain studies.....	700,000	700,000	700,000	700,000
Subtotal, collection and study of basic data.....	1,515,000	1,515,000	1,515,000	1,515,000
<b>3. Research and development:</b>				
(a) Beach erosion development studies.....	400,000	400,000	400,000	400,000
(b) Hydrologic studies.....	175,000	175,000	175,000	175,000
(c) Civil works investigations.....	1,550,000	1,300,000	1,300,000	1,300,000
(d) Mississippi Basin model:				
(1) Construction.....	650,000	650,000	650,000	650,000
(2) Mississippi River comprehensive study.....	200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
(e) Nuclear explosives studies for civil construction.....	665,000	400,000	665,000	500,000
Subtotal, research and development.....	3,640,000	3,125,000	3,390,000	3,225,000
Other reductions and slippages <sup>1</sup> .....		-272,200		-125,000
Total, general investigations.....	17,265,000	16,561,900	19,192,300	17,870,300

<sup>1</sup> House cut in north-central division program.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Alabama:									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Claborn lock and dam		\$210,000		\$210,000		\$210,000		\$210,000
(N)	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	\$2,254,000		\$2,254,000		\$2,179,000		\$2,179,000	
(N)	Holt lock and dam	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(MP)	Jones Bluff lock and dam		150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000
(N)	Mobile Ferry lock and dam	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N)	Mobile Harbor					600,000		600,000	
(FC)	Paint Rock River	350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000	
(N)	Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Alabama and Mississippi					500,000	225,000		
	Tombigbee River and tributaries, Alabama and Mississippi. (See Mississippi.)								
(MP)	Walter F. George (Fort Gaines) lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia	8,138,000		8,138,000		8,073,000		8,073,000	
Alaska:									
(MP)	Bradley Lake (not authorized)		1100,000				100,000		
(FC)	Fairbanks		60,000		60,000		60,000		60,000
(N)	Juneau Harbor	760,000		760,000		760,000		760,000	
Arizona:									
(FC)	Alamo Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Gila and Salt Rivers		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(FC)	Gila River and tributaries—downstream from Painted Rock (not authorized)		1100,000				100,000		100,000
(FC)	Tucson	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
Arkansas:									
(N)	Arkansas River and tributaries, Arkansas and Oklahoma:								
	(a) Bank stabilization and channel rectification	18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000		18,000,000	
	(b) Navigation locks and dams		2,000,000		2,000,000	600,000	2,000,000	300,000	2,000,000
(MP)	Beaver Reservoir	14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000		14,000,000	
(MP)	Bull Shoals Reservoir, Ark. and Mo., additions of units Nos. 7 and 8	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(MP)	Dardanelle lock and dam	16,000,000		16,000,000		16,000,000		16,000,000	
(FC)	De Queen Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(MP)	DeGray Reservoir	950,000		1,550,000		1,550,000		1,550,000	
(FC)	Dierks Reservoir						30,000		30,000
(FC)	Garland City, Red River	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC)	Gilliam Reservoir		99,000		99,000	350,000	99,000	350,000	99,000
(MP)	Greers Ferry Reservoir	4,900,000		4,900,000		4,832,000		4,832,000	
(FC)	Millwood Reservoir	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(N)	Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La.		235,000		235,000	165,000	235,000	165,000	235,000
(N)	Ozark lock and dam		300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000
(FC)	Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Ark., La., and Tex.	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
California:									
(FC)	Alameda Creek (not authorized)		1100,000				100,000		100,000
(FC)	Bear Creek	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Black Butte Reservoir	3,529,000		3,529,000		3,529,000		3,529,000	
(FC)	Comanche Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(R)	Crescent City Harbor (breakwater)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Drycreek Reservoir channel improvement not authorized		1100,000				100,000		
(FC)	Hidden Reservoir (not authorized)		175,000				75,000		
(BE)	Imperial Beach, San Diego County (reimbursement)	20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000	
(FC)	Los Angeles County drainage area	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
(N)	Los Angeles and Long Beach Harbors (1960 act)					1,705,000		1,705,000	
(FC)	Lower San Joaquin River and tributaries	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(N)	Monterey Harbor		90,000		90,000		90,000		90,000
(R)	Morro Bay (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(FC)	New Hogan Reservoir	4,140,000		4,140,000		4,140,000		4,140,000	
(N)	Noyo River and Harbor Mooring Basin						26,000		26,000
(BE)	Oceanside (reimbursement)	672,000		672,000		672,000		672,000	
(FC)	Oroville Reservoir	15,000,000		14,000,000		15,000,000		14,000,000	
(FC)	Russian River Basin (Coyote Valley Dam)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River bank protection		50,000		50,000	150,000	50,000	150,000	50,000
(FC)	Sacramento River and major and minor tributaries	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River, Chico Landing to Red Bluff	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(N)	Sacramento River deep water ship channel	5,910,000		5,910,000		5,910,000		5,910,000	
(FC)	Sacramento River flood control project	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(BE)	Santa Cruz County (reimbursement)	70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000	
(N)	Santa Cruz Harbor	1,520,000		1,520,000		1,520,000		1,520,000	
(FC)	Stewart Canyon debris basin	522,000		522,000		522,000		522,000	
(FC)	Tahchevah Creek		110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000
(FC)	Walnut Creek		225,000		225,000		225,000		225,000
(FC)	West Fork Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
Colorado:									
(FC)	Trinidad Reservoir		155,000		155,000		155,000		155,000
Connecticut:									
(FC)	Ansonia-Derby (not authorized)		1100,000				100,000		
(FC)	Black Rock Reservoir						50,000		50,000
(N)	Bridgeport Harbor, Black Rock Harbor		26,000				26,000		26,000
(FC)	Colebrook River Reservoir		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	East Branch Reservoir	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC)	Hancock Brook Reservoir	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Hop Brook Reservoir		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Mad River Reservoir	1,826,000		1,826,000		1,826,000		1,826,000	
(FC)	Northfield Brook Reservoir		400,000			400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Stamford		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	West Thompson Reservoir		142,000		342,000		342,000		342,000

See footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Delaware:									
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchorages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantau Creek anchorages, Delaware and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
	Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes), Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
(R)	Indian River Inlet (bulkheads)	\$750,000		\$750,000		\$750,000		\$750,000	
(N)	Inland waterway, Delaware River to Chesapeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal), pt. II, Delaware and Maryland	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(BE)	Rehoboth Beach to Indian River Inlet (reimbursement)	110,000		110,000		110,000		110,000	
Florida:									
(N)	Apalachicola River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(N)	Bakers Haulover Inlet		\$15,000		\$15,000	25,000	\$15,000	25,000	\$15,000
(N)	Canaveral Harbor (not authorized)		180,000				80,000		80,000
(FC)	Central and southern Florida	13,500,000		13,500,000		13,500,000		13,500,000	
(N)	Cross-Florida Barge Canal		205,000				205,000		205,000
(FC)	Four Rivers Basin (not authorized)						150,000		
(N)	Intracoastal Waterway:								
	(a) Caloosahatchee River to Anclote River	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
	(b) Jacksonville to Miami	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N)	Miami Harbor (1960 act)	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(BE)	Palm Beach County, Lake Worth Inlet to South Lake Worth Inlet (reimbursement)	15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000	
(N)	Port Everglades Harbor (1958 act)	677,000		677,000		677,000		677,000	
(N)	St. Marks River	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	St. Petersburg Harbor (deferred)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
Georgia:									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(MP)	Carters Dam	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Columbia lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP)	Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C.	3,700,000		3,700,000		3,649,500		3,649,500	
	Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia. (See Alabama.)								
(MP)	West Point Dam (not authorized)		\$100,000				100,000		100,000
Hawaii:									
(N)	Hilo Harbor		600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000
(N)	Kaunakakai Harbor (not authorized)						115,000		
(FC)	Wailoa Stream	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Idaho:									
(MP)	Bruce Eddy Reservoir (construction not yet authorized)					2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:								
	Boise Valley		21,000		21,000		21,000		21,000
(FC)	Ririe Dam (not authorized)		75,000				75,000		75,000
Illinois:									
(FC)	Beardstown	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ind. and Ill. (not authorized)		\$110,000				110,000		110,000
(R)	Calumet Harbor and River (breakwater), Ill. and Ind.	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N)	Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.:								
	(a) 25-foot depth in river channels, Cargil docks to Torrence Ave.								
	(b) 29-foot approach channel, 28-foot outer harbor, and 27-foot entrance	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(BA)	Calumet River bridge alterations	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC)	Carlyle Reservoir	6,400,000		6,400,000		6,400,000		6,400,000	
(R)	Chicago Harbor (breakwater)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC)	Clear Creek Drainage and Levee District	70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000	
(FC)	Clear Lake Special Drainage District (not authorized)						40,000		40,000
(N)	Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri	858,000		858,000		858,000		858,000	
(FC)	Drury Drainage District	435,000		435,000		435,000		435,000	
(FC)	East St. Louis and vicinity	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC)	Freeport				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 1		32,000		32,000		32,000		32,000
(FC)	Henderson County Drainage District No. 2		38,000		38,000		38,000		38,000
(FC)	Hunt Drainage District and Lima Lake Drainage District	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(N)	Illinois Waterway, Calumet-Sag Channel, pt. I, Illinois and Indiana	9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000		9,500,000	
(FC)	Indian Grave Drainage District		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N)	Kaskaskia River (not authorized)		\$100,000				100,000		100,000
(N)	Mississippi River between the Ohio and Missouri Rivers, Ill. and Mo.:								
	(a) Regulating works	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
	(b) Chain of Rocks	50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000	
(FC)	Mount Carmel (not authorized)		\$75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC)	New Athens		73,000		73,000		73,000		73,000
(FC)	Oakley Reservoir (not authorized)		\$125,000				125,000		125,000
(FC)	Rochester and McClearys Bluff levee		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC)	Shelbyville Reservoir	328,000		328,000		328,000		328,000	
(FC)	Sny Island Levee Drainage District		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	South Quincy Drainage and Levee District		27,000		27,000		27,000		27,000
(FC)	Subdistrict No. 1 of Drainage Union No. 1 and Bay Island Levee and Drainage District	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(FC)	The Sny Basin	3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000		3,800,000	
(FC)	Tri Pond levee		48,000		48,000		48,000		48,000

See footnotes at end of table.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Indiana:								
(FC) Brookville Reservoir				\$75,000		\$75,000		\$75,000
(N) Calumet River and Harbor, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky	\$2,750,000		\$2,750,000		\$2,750,000		\$2,750,000	
(FC) Evansville	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Greenfield Bayou levee (deferred)		\$10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(FC) Huntington Reservoir					1,000,000		1,000,000	
(N) Illinois Waterway, Ill. and Ind. (See Illinois.)								
(N) Indiana Harbor, 1960 act	510,000		510,000		510,000		510,000	
(FC) Levee unit 5, Wabash River	250,000		250,000		350,000		350,000	
(N) Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Mason J. Niblack levee	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(N) McAlpine locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC) Mississinewa Reservoir	1,690,000		1,690,000		2,000,000		1,690,000	
(FC) Monroe Reservoir	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
(N) Newburg lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky				150,000		150,000		150,000
(FC) Salamonie Reservoir	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(N) Uniontown locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) West Terre Haute	332,000		332,000		332,000		332,000	
Iowa:								
(FC) Chariton River, Iowa and Mo.				50,000		50,000		50,000
(FC) Coralville Reservoir, Mehaflay Bridge		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Des Moines		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Floyd River and tributaries	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Green Bay Levee and Drainage District No. 2	100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000	
(FC) Indian Creek (not authorized)		150,000				50,000		50,000
(FC) Iowa River—Flint Creek Levee District No. 16	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Little Sioux River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska (active units)	2,300,000		2,350,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska:								
(a) Sioux City, Iowa, to Omaha, Nebr.	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
(b) Omaha, Nebr., to Kansas City	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
(c) Kansas City to the mouth	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Muscatine Island Levee District and Muscatine-Louis County Drainage District No. 13	150,000		150,000		150,000		150,000	
(FC) Rathbun Reservoir		159,000		159,000		159,000		159,000
(FC) Red Rock Reservoir	9,800,000		9,800,000		9,800,000		9,800,000	
Kansas:								
(FC) Cedar Point Reservoir (deferred)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Council Grove Reservoir	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
(FC) Dodge City (not authorized)		150,000				50,000		50,000
(FC) Elk City Reservoir	2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000		2,700,000	
(N) Fort Leavenworth Bridge	430,000		430,000		430,000		430,000	
(FC) Fort Scott Reservoir (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Frankfort	825,000		825,000		825,000		825,000	
(FC) John Redmond (Strawn) Reservoir	9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000		9,000,000	
(FC) Kansas City, Kans. and Mo.	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(FC) Lawrence		78,000		78,000		78,000		78,000
(FC) Manhattan	1,050,000		1,050,000		1,050,000		1,050,000	
(FC) Marion Reservoir		71,000		71,000		71,000		71,000
(FC) Melvern Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Milford Reservoir	11,600,000		11,600,000		11,600,000		11,600,000	
(N) Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(N) Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Osawatimile		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Perry Reservoir					750,000		750,000	
(FC) Pomona Reservoir	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Topeka	2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000		2,200,000	
(FC) Tuttle Creek Reservoir	2,632,000		2,632,000		2,632,000		2,632,000	
(FC) Wilson Reservoir	4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000		4,400,000	
Kentucky:								
(MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn.	31,200,000		31,200,000		31,147,000		31,147,000	
(FC) Barren River Reservoir	10,110,000		10,110,000		10,110,000		10,110,000	
(MP) Booneville Reservoir						100,000		
(N) Cannelton locks and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(N) Capt. Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio	10,200,000		10,200,000		10,172,000		10,172,000	
(FC) Cave Run Reservoir		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(FC) Corbin	200,000		200,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC) Fishtrap Reservoir	6,700,000		6,700,000		6,700,000		6,700,000	
(FC) Frankfort (deferred)				25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC) Grayson Reservoir		371,000		371,000		371,000		371,000
(FC) Green River Reservoir			1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) Laurel River Reservoir		653,000		653,000		653,000		653,000
(N) Markland locks and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio	7,977,000		7,977,000		7,785,000		7,785,000	
(N) McAlpine locks and dam (Louisville), Indiana and Kentucky	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(N) Newburgh lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								
(FC) Nolin Reservoir	2,536,000		2,536,000		2,447,500		2,447,500	
(N) Uniontown lock and dam, Indiana and Kentucky. (See Indiana.)								

See footnotes at end of table.

CVIII—1477



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>Louisiana:</b>								
(N) Aquatic plant control, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Car- olina, South Carolina, and Texas.....	\$940,000	-----	\$940,000	-----	\$940,000	-----	\$940,000	-----
(N) Bayou LaFourche and LaFourche Jump Waterway.....	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(N) Bayou Le Carpe (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	<sup>1</sup> (45,000)	-----	<sup>1</sup> (45,000)	-----
(N) Calcasieu River and Pass (1960 act).....	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----	2,500,000	-----
(N) Calcasieu River salt water barrier (not au- thorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	\$56,000	-----	\$56,000
(FC) Campti Clarence levee (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	50,000	-----	50,000
(N) Freshwater Bayou.....	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
(N) Mississippi River, Baton Rouge to the Gulf of Mexico.....	2,569,000	-----	2,569,000	-----	2,569,000	-----	2,569,000	-----
(N) Mississippi River gulf outlet.....	8,000,000	-----	8,000,000	-----	8,000,000	-----	8,000,000	-----
(FC) New Orleans to Venice, La., Hurricane Pro- tection (not authorized).....	-----	†\$265,000	-----	-----	-----	265,000	-----	265,000
Ouachita and Black Rivers, Ark. and La. (See Arkansas.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
<b>Maine:</b>								
(N) Bass Harbor.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	<sup>2</sup> (183,000)	-----	<sup>2</sup> (183,000)	-----
(N) Kennebec River (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	17,000	-----	17,000
(N) Portland Harbor, deepen to 45 ft. (not au- thorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	550,000	-----	550,000	-----
Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine (not authorized). (See New Hampshire.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N) Seaport Harbor (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	10,000	-----	10,000
<b>Maryland:</b>								
(N) Baltimore Harbor and channels (1958 act).....	4,100,000	-----	4,100,000	-----	4,100,000	-----	4,100,000	-----
(FC) Bloomington Reservoir (not authorized).....	-----	†100,000	-----	-----	-----	100,000	-----	-----
Inland waterway, Delaware River to Ches- apeake Bay (Chesapeake and Delaware Canal) Part II, Delaware and Maryland. (See Delaware.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(N) Pocomoke River.....	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
<b>Massachusetts:</b>								
(R) Cape Cod Canal-Bourne Bridge.....	-----	38,000	-----	\$38,000	-----	38,000	-----	38,000
(N) Chelsea River (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	15,000	-----	-----
(FC) Chicopee Falls.....	350,000	-----	350,000	-----	350,000	-----	350,000	-----
(FC) Conant Brook Reservoir.....	-----	160,000	-----	160,000	-----	160,000	-----	160,000
(FC) Littleville Reservoir.....	1,900,000	-----	2,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	2,200,000	-----
(FC) New Bedford-Fairhaven and Acushnet barriers. Provincetown Harbor.....	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
(N) Three Rivers.....	-----	15,000	-----	15,000	-----	15,000	-----	15,000
(FC) Wareham-Marion (not authorized).....	-----	50,000	-----	350,000	-----	350,000	-----	350,000
(FC) Wareham-Marion (not authorized).....	-----	73,000	-----	-----	-----	73,000	-----	73,000
(BE) Westagussett Beach (reimbursement).....	23,000	-----	23,000	-----	23,000	-----	23,000	-----
(FC) Westfield.....	-----	120,000	-----	120,000	-----	120,000	-----	120,000
<b>Michigan:</b>								
(N) Detroit River Channel north of Belle Isle.....	-----	-----	-----	-----	<sup>1</sup> (380,000)	-----	<sup>1</sup> (380,000)	-----
(N) Detroit River, enlarge Trenton Channel.....	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,000,000	-----
(N) Gladstone Harbor Little Bay DeNoc (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	<sup>1</sup> (350,000)	-----	<sup>1</sup> (350,000)	-----
(R) Grand Haven Harbor (piers and revetment).....	830,000	-----	830,000	-----	830,000	-----	830,000	-----
(N) Great Lakes connecting channels.....	3,200,000	-----	3,200,000	-----	3,200,000	-----	3,200,000	-----
(N) Hammond Bay Harbor.....	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----	1,000,000	-----
(R) Holland Harbor (piers, revetment, and break- water).....	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(N) Little Lake Harbor.....	610,000	-----	610,000	-----	610,000	-----	610,000	-----
(R) Ludington Harbor (piers, revetments, and breakwater).....	-----	40,000	-----	400,000	-----	40,000	-----	40,000
(N) Manistee Harbor.....	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----
(R) Manistee Harbor (piers, revetment, and breakwater).....	-----	45,000	-----	45,000	-----	45,000	-----	45,000
(R) Manistique Harbor (breakwaters).....	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(R) Marquette Harbor (minor rehabilitation).....	(300,000)	-----	(300,000)	-----	(300,000)	-----	(300,000)	-----
(R) Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin.....	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(N) Muskegon Harbor (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	18,000	-----	-----
(FC) Presque Isle Harbor (minor rehabilitation).....	(140,000)	-----	(140,000)	-----	(140,000)	-----	(140,000)	-----
(N) River Rouge (not authorized).....	-----	150,000	-----	-----	-----	50,000	-----	50,000
(N) Saginaw River.....	1,666,000	-----	1,666,000	-----	1,666,000	-----	1,666,000	-----
(FC) Saginaw River.....	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(R) St. Joseph Harbor (piers and revetments).....	81,000	-----	81,000	-----	81,000	-----	81,000	-----
(N) St. Marys River, New Poe lock.....	750,000	-----	750,000	-----	750,000	-----	750,000	-----
(R) South Haven Harbor (piers and revetments).....	570,000	-----	570,000	-----	570,000	-----	570,000	-----
<b>Minnesota:</b>								
(N) Duluth-Superior Harbor: (a) Inner harbor 27-foot and 23-foot chan- nels.....	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----	300,000	-----
(FC) (b) Outer harbor 32-foot to 27-foot channel.....	2,580,000	-----	2,580,000	-----	2,580,000	-----	2,580,000	-----
(R) Marshall, Redwood River.....	750,000	-----	750,000	-----	750,000	-----	750,000	-----
Reservoirs at headwaters of Mississippi River (Winnibigoshish Dam).....	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000
(N) St. Anthony Falls extension.....	4,430,000	-----	4,000,000	-----	4,430,000	-----	4,430,000	-----
(FC) St. Paul and South St. Paul.....	1,700,000	-----	1,700,000	-----	1,700,000	-----	1,700,000	-----
<b>Mississippi:</b>								
(FC) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.) Jackson and East Jackson.....	-----	123,000	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	500,000	-----
(FC) Okatibbee Creek Reservoir (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	150,000	-----	150,000
(N) Pascagoula Harbor (not authorized).....	-----	-----	-----	-----	1,500,000	-----	1,500,000	-----
Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway, Ala. and Miss. (See Alabama.)	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
(FC) Tombigbee River and tributaries.....	-----	106,000	-----	106,000	-----	106,000	-----	106,000

See footnotes at end of table.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Missouri:								
Bull Shoals Reservoir, units 7 and 8, Arkansas and Missouri. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC) Canton	\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000		\$200,000	
(FC) Cape Girardeau and vicinity	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
Chariton River, Iowa and Mo. (See Iowa.)								
Dam 27, Mississippi River between St. Louis and lock and dam 26, Illinois and Missouri. (See Illinois.)								
(FC) Gregory Drainage District (not authorized)						\$50,000		\$50,000
(FC) Hannibal (not authorized)		\$50,000				50,000		50,000
(MP) Joanna Reservoir (not authorized)				\$100,000		100,000		100,000
Kansas City, Kans. and Mo. (See Kansas.)								
(MP) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir (with power)		267,000		267,000		267,000		267,000
(FC) Kaysinger Bluff Reservoir, highway construc- tion	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
Mississippi River between the Ohio and Mis- souri Rivers, Ill. and Mo., regulating works. (See Illinois.)								
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kan- sas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River Channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Perry County Drainage and Levee Districts 1, 2, and 3	180,000		180,000		180,000		180,000	
(FC) St. Louis	8,800,000		8,800,000		8,800,000		8,800,000	
(FC) South River Drainage District			100,000		100,000		100,000	
(MP) Stockton Reservoir	900,000		900,000		900,000		900,000	
(FC) Union Township Drainage District (not authorized)						40,000		40,000
Montana:								
(MP) Libby Reservoir		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000		2,600,000
Nebraska:								
(FC) Little Papillion Creek (not authorized)		\$50,000				50,000		50,000
Missouri River agricultural levees, Iowa, Kan- sas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
Missouri River channel stabilization, Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, and Nebraska. (See Iowa.)								
(FC) Norfolk						80,000		80,000
(FC) Salt Creek and tributaries	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(FC) Waterloo					100,000		100,000	
Nevada:								
(FC) Humboldt River (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(FC) Las Vegas Wash		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
New Hampshire:								
(FC) Claremont Reservoir (deferred)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000
(FC) Hopkinton-Everett Reservoir	2,587,000		2,587,000		2,567,000		2,567,000	
(N) Portsmouth Harbor and Piscataqua River, N.H., and Maine (not authorized)						100,000		100,000
New Jersey:								
(BE) Atlantic City (reimbursement)	129,000		129,000		129,000		129,000	
(BE) Barnegat Light (reimbursement)	62,000		62,000		62,000		62,000	
(R) Cold Spring Inlet (breakwater)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(N) Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton, Pennsylvania and New Jersey	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(N) Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea, anchor- ages at Reedy Point, Deepwater Point, and enlarging Marcus Hook and Mantua Creek anchorage			300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R) Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes) New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware	750,000		750,000		750,000		750,000	
(BE) Long Beach Island (reimbursement)	42,000		42,000		42,000		42,000	
(R) Manasquan Inlet (bulkheads)		10,000		10,000		10,000		10,000
(R) New Jersey Intracoastal Waterway (jetties)		12,000		12,000		12,000		12,000
(BE) Ocean City (reimbursement)	158,000		158,000		158,000		158,000	
(BE) Raritan Bay-Sandy Hook Bay (not author- ized)					500,000		500,000	
(MP) Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized)		\$200,000				200,000		
New Mexico:								
(FC) Alamogordo diversion channel (not author- ized)						50,000		50,000
(FC) Cochiti Reservoir		350,000		350,000		350,000		350,000
(FC) Galisteo Reservoir		200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000
(FC) Las Cruces (not authorized)		\$50,000				50,000		
(FC) Socorro	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Two Rivers Reservoir	1,911,000		1,911,000		1,911,000		1,911,000	
New York:								
(FC) Allegany (deferred)		7,000		7,000		7,000		7,000
Allegheny River Reservoir, N.Y. and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N) Buffalo Harbor:								
(a) Deepen north entrance, Buffalo River entrance, Buffalo River, Buffalo Ship canal	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
(b) South entrance, 28-, 29-, and 30-foot channel (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Fire Island to Montauk Point		250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000
(N) Flushing Bay and Creek (not authorized)			1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N) Great Lakes to Hudson River Waterway	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(R) Great Sodus Bay (piers)	473,000		473,000		473,000		473,000	
(FC) Herkimer	880,000		880,000		880,000		880,000	
(N) Hudson River, New York City to Albany	5,300,000		5,300,000		5,300,000		5,300,000	
(FC) Ithaca (Cayuga Inlet)		112,000		112,000		112,000		112,000
(FC) Lackawanna		78,000		78,000		78,000		78,000
(FC) Lake Chataqua and Chataqua River		35,000		35,000		35,000		35,000
(N) New York Harbor, 35-foot channel from ocean to bayside	1,537,000		1,537,000		1,537,000		1,537,000	

See footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project		Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning	Construction	Planning
(1)		(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<b>New York—Continued</b>									
(N)	Rochester Harbor	\$900,000		\$900,000		\$900,000		\$900,000	
(BE)	Selkirk Shores State Park (reimbursement)	40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000	
(FC)	South Amsterdam	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
	Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized) (see New Jersey).								
<b>North Carolina:</b>									
	Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
(FC)	New Hope Reservoir (not authorized)		\$100,000				\$100,000		\$100,000
(FC)	Wilkesboro Reservoir	800,000		800,000		779,000		779,000	
(N)	Wilmington Harbor, 38- and 40-foot depth (not authorized)						135,000		
<b>North Dakota:</b>									
(FC)	Bowman-Haley Reservoir (not authorized)						180,000		180,000
(MP)	Garrison Reservoir	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
	Oahe Reservoir, N. Dak. and S. Dak. (See South Dakota.)								
<b>Ohio:</b>									
(N)	Ashtabula Harbor (1960 act)	1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000		1,200,000	
(N)	Belleville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC)	Big Darby Creek Reservoir				\$250,000		250,000		250,000
(FC)	Buck Creek Reservoir (not authorized)						75,000		75,000
	Captain Anthony Meldahl locks and dam, Kentucky and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(N)	Cleveland Harbor:								
	(a) Bridge replacements widening, Cuyahoga and Old River and deepening channel in east basin and outer harbor (1958 act)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
	(b) 28-foot approach channel, 27-foot entrance channel, 27-foot river channel, 28 feet in west basin (1960 act)	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(R)	Cleveland Harbor (breakwater)	253,000		253,000		253,000		253,000	
(R)	Conneaut Harbor (breakwater)	265,000		265,000		265,000		265,000	
(FC)	Deer Creek Reservoir				250,000		250,000		250,000
(N)	Fairport Harbor	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(N)	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(N)	Lorain Harbor (1960 act)	3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Markland lock and dam, Indiana, Kentucky, and Ohio. (See Kentucky.)								
(FC)	Paint Creek Reservoir				250,000		250,000		250,000
(N)	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia	12,400,000		12,400,000		12,348,250		12,348,250	
(N)	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia		395,000		395,000		395,000		395,000
(N)	Sandusky Harbor (1960 act)	1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000		1,800,000	
(R)	Sandusky Harbor (east jetty)	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa. (See Pennsylvania.)								
(N)	Toledo Harbor (1950, 1958, and 1960 acts)	4,700,000		4,700,000		4,700,000		4,700,000	
(FC)	West Branch Reservoir, Mahoning River	2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000		2,400,000	
<b>Oklahoma:</b>									
	Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), Oklahoma and Texas (not authorized). (See Texas.)								
	Arkansas River and tributaries bank stabilization and channel rectification, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
	Arkansas River and tributaries navigation locks and dam, Arkansas and Oklahoma. (See Arkansas.)								
(FC)	Birch Reservoir (not authorized)						20,000		20,000
(FC)	Broken Bow Reservoir	3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000		3,400,000	
(MP)	Eufaula Reservoir	31,300,000		31,300,000		31,265,000		31,265,000	
(FC)	Kaw Reservoir (not authorized)		75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC)	Keystone Reservoir	21,000,000		21,000,000		20,990,000		20,990,000	
(FC)	Optima Reservoir (deferred)						50,000		50,000
(FC)	Pine Creek Reservoir	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(MP)	Short Mountain lock and dam		531,000		531,000		531,000		531,000
(FC)	Skiatook Reservoir (not authorized)		140,000				40,000		
(N)	Wabers Falls lock and dam		325,000		325,000		325,000		325,000
<b>Oregon:</b>									
(FC)	Blue River Reservoir					500,000		500,000	
(N)	Columbia and Lower Willamette River below Vancouver, Wash. and Portland, Ore. (not authorized):								
	(a) 40-foot channel								100,000
	(b) 35 feet from mouth of Willamette River to Vancouver		\$100,000				\$100,000		
(N)	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington		130,000		130,000		130,000		130,000
(R)	Columbia River at the mouth (jetties), Oregon and Washington	2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000		2,000,000	
(FC)	Columbia River local protection:								
	John Day River		20,000		20,000		20,000		20,000
(N)	Coos and Millicoma Rivers				23,000		23,000		23,000
(R)	Coos Bay (south jetty)	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
(MP)	Congar Reservoir	9,100,000		9,100,000		9,079,000		9,079,000	
(FC)	Fall Creek Reservoir	1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000		1,900,000	
(MP)	Green Peter Reservoir	6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000		6,100,000	
(MP)	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington	43,000,000		43,000,000		43,000,000		43,000,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington	400,000		400,000		400,000		400,000	
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
	(a) Beaver Drainage District	516,000		516,000		516,000		516,000	
(R)	Siuslaw River (south jetty)	720,000		720,000		720,000		720,000	
(R)	Tillamook Bay and Harbor (north jetty)	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(R)	Umpqua River (south jetty)	2,160,000		2,160,000		2,160,000		2,160,000	
(FC)	Willamette River Basin bank protection	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(N)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(R)	Yaquina Bay and Harbor (jetties)		30,000		30,000		30,000		30,000

See footnotes at end of table.

## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)	Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>Pennsylvania:</b>								
(FC) Allegheny River Reservoir, Pa. and N.Y.	\$24,800,000		\$24,800,000		\$24,800,000		\$24,800,000	
(FC) Beltzville Reservoir (not authorized)		\$100,000				\$100,000		\$100,000
(FC) Bethlehem	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC) Blanchard Reservoir		350,000		\$350,000		350,000		350,000
(FC) Butler	700,000		700,000		700,000		700,000	
(FC) Curwensville Reservoir	5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000		5,000,000	
(N) Dam 4, Monongahela River	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
Delaware River, Philadelphia to sea (main dikes), Delaware, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. (See New Jersey.)								
Delaware River, Philadelphia Naval Base to Trenton. (See New Jersey.)								
(N) Erie Harbor (1960 act)	1,220,000		1,220,000		1,220,000		1,220,000	
(FC) Latrobe		75,000		75,000		75,000		75,000
(N) Maxwell locks and dam, Monongahela River	7,800,000		7,800,000		7,748,250		7,748,250	
(BE) Presque Isle Peninsula (reimbursement)	186,000		186,000		186,000		186,000	
(FC) Ridgway	241,000		241,000		241,000		241,000	
(FC) Shenango River Reservoir, Ohio and Pa.	7,600,000		7,600,000		7,600,000		7,600,000	
(FC) Tioga-Hammond Reservoir		100,000				100,000		
Tocks Island Reservoir, Pa. and N.J. (not authorized). (See New Jersey.)								
(FC) Turtle Creek	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(FC) Union City Reservoir (not authorized)		50,000				50,000		50,000
<b>Puerto Rico:</b>								
(N) San Juan Harbor	4,500,000		2,400,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
<b>Rhode Island:</b>								
(FC) Fox Point barrier	4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(FC) Lower Woonsocket	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R) Point Judith Harbor (breakwater)	810,000		810,000		810,000		810,000	
<b>South Carolina:</b>								
(N) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
Charleston Harbor (1945 act)	824,000		824,000		824,000		824,000	
Hartwell Reservoir, Ga. and S.C. (See Georgia.)								
<b>South Dakota:</b>								
(MP) Big Bend Reservoir	26,000,000		26,000,000		26,000,000		26,000,000	
(FC) Cottonwood Springs Reservoirs (deferred)		15,000		15,000		15,000		15,000
(MP) Fort Randall Reservoir	2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000		2,300,000	
(MP) Oahe Reservoir, S. Dak. and N. Dak.	20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000		20,000,000	
<b>Tennessee:</b>								
(MP) Barkley Dam, Ky. and Tenn. (See Kentucky.)		309,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) Cordell Hull Dam		404,000	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(MP) J. Percy Priest Reservoir								
<b>Texas:</b>								
(FC) Aquatic plant control. (See Louisiana.)								
Arkansas-Red Rivers salinity control (initial phase), (Oklahoma and Texas not authorized)					300,000		300,000	
(N) Barbour Cut, La Porte			(58,500)		(58,500)		(58,500)	
(FC) Bardwell Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Big Fossil Creek		45,000		45,000		45,000		45,000
(FC) Bladders Creek Reservoir, New Braunfels		50,000		50,000		50,000		50,000
(N) Brazos Island Harbor (1960 act)					500,000		500,000	
(FC) Buffalo Bayou and tributaries	4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000		4,800,000	
(FC) Canyon Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000		3,200,000	
(FC) Fort Worth Floodway (Clear Fork) (not authorized)		75,000				75,000		75,000
(FC) Fort Worth Floodway upstream extension		70,000		70,000		70,000		70,000
(R) Galveston Harbor (jetties)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(N) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway:								
Guadalupe River channel to Victoria	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
(R) Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Port O'Connor (dikes)		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(N) Houston ship channel:								
(a) Bend easing and widening to 36-foot depth only	3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000		3,500,000	
(b) Deepening to 40 feet (phase II)	948,000		948,000		948,000		948,000	
(N) Matagorda ship channel, 38- and 36-foot channels	4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000		4,500,000	
(MP) McGee Bend Dam	10,200,000		10,200,000		10,200,000		10,200,000	
(FC) Navarro Mills Reservoir	2,080,000		2,080,000		2,005,000		2,005,000	
(N) Port Aransas-Corpus Christi Waterway:								
(a) Channel to Viola, 36-foot depth, phase I	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000	
(b) Deepening existing project to 40 and 42 feet			500,000		500,000		500,000	
(FC) Port Arthur—hurricane protection (not authorized)		115,000				115,000		115,000
(FC) Proctor Reservoir	4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000		4,600,000	
Red River levees and bank stabilization below Denison Dam, Arkansas, Louisiana, and Texas. (See Arkansas.)								
(N) Sabine-Neches Waterway	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
Port Arthur Bridge								50,000
(FC) San Antonio Channel	1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000		1,000,000	
(FC) Somerville Reservoir	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC) Stillhouse Hollow Dam	1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000		1,700,000	
(R) Texas City	1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000		1,300,000	
(R) Texas City Channel (dike)		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) Vince and Little Vince Bayou (not authorized)		50,000				50,000		50,000
(FC) Waco Reservoir	15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000		15,000,000	
<b>Utah:</b>								
(FC) Weber River	250,000		250,000		250,000		250,000	
<b>Vermont:</b>								
(R) Burlington Harbor (breakwater)	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
<b>Virginia:</b>								
(FC) Gathright Reservoir and Falling Springs re-regulating dam (deferred)		40,000		40,000		40,000		40,000
(FC) John W. Flannagan (Pound) Reservoir	3,200,000		3,200,000		3,584,000		3,200,000	
(FC) Norfolk (not authorized)		87,000				87,000		87,000
(FC) North Fork of Pound Reservoir	500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000	

See footnotes at end of table.



## Construction, general, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Construction, general, State and project (1)		Revised budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
Washington:									
(FC)	Colfax	\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000		\$1,200,000	
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington—jetties. (See Oregon.)								
	Columbia River at the mouth, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(N)	Everett Harbor and Snohomish River	1,208,000		1,208,000		1,208,000		1,208,000	
(FC)	Howard A. Hanson (Eagle Gorge) Reservoir	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	John Day lock and dam, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(MP)	Little Goose lock and dam	1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000		1,600,000	
	Lower Columbia River bank protection, Oregon and Washington. (See Oregon.)								
(FC)	Lower Columbia River improvement to existing works:								
	Cowlitz County Consolidated Diking and Improvement District No. 2		\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000		\$50,000
(FC)	Lower Columbia River levees at new locations: Kalama River, south area		500,000		500,000		500,000		500,000
(MP)	Lower Granite lock and dam	18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000		18,500,000	
(FC)	Pullman		25,000		25,000		25,000		25,000
(FC)	Sammamish River	1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000		1,060,000	
West Virginia:									
	Bellville locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Buckhannon (not authorized)		\$30,000				30,000		30,000
(FC)	Burnsville Reservoir (deferred)		35,000		65,000		65,000		65,000
(FC)	East Lynn Reservoir		100,000		100,000		100,000		100,000
(FC)	Justice Reservoir (not authorized)						150,000		
	Hannibal locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(N)	Opekiska lock and dam	6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000		6,000,000	
	Pike Island locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
	Racine locks and dam, Ohio and West Virginia. (See Ohio.)								
(FC)	Summersville Reservoir	9,750,000		9,750,000		9,750,000		9,750,000	
Wisconsin:									
(N)	Ashland Harbor	340,000		340,000		340,000		340,000	
	Duluth-Superior Harbor, Minnesota and Wisconsin. (See Minnesota.)								
(FC)	Eau Galle River	340,000		340,000		340,000		340,000	
(N)	Green Bay Harbor			260,000		260,000		260,000	
(N)	Kenosha Harbor (not authorized)						15,000		15,000
	Menominee Harbor (piers), Michigan and Wisconsin. (See Michigan.)								
(R)	Milwaukee Harbor (breakwater)	300,000		300,000		300,000		300,000	
(R)	Sheboygan Harbor (pier and breakwater)	320,000		320,000		320,000		320,000	
(R)	Sturgeon Bay and Lake Michigan ship canal (revetments)	360,000		360,000		360,000		360,000	
Wyoming:									
(FC)	Jackson Hole	430,000		430,000		430,000		430,000	
(FC)	Sheridan	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
Miscellaneous:									
(FC)	Emergency bank protection	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
(FC)	Local protection projects not requiring specific legislation	3,000,000		3,000,000		4,000,000		4,000,000	
(N)	Small navigation projects not requiring specific legislation (costing up to \$200,000)	1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000		1,500,000	
(FC)	Snagging and clearing	200,000		200,000		200,000		200,000	
	Projects deferred for restudy		(217,000)		(272,000)		(272,000)		(272,000)
	Recreation facilities, completed projects	4,000,000		4,150,000		4,150,000		4,150,000	
	Small authorized projects	1,500,000		1,500,000		3,000,000		3,000,000	
	Fish and wildlife studies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service)	600,000		600,000		600,000		600,000	
(R)	Minor rehabilitation projects (costing up to \$400,000)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000	
	Employees compensation	22,000		22,000		22,000		22,000	
	Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages	-60,000,000		-80,000,000		-60,000,000		-70,000,000	
Grand total, construction, general		761,045,000	19,600,000	745,867,000	16,494,000	786,130,500	21,832,000	772,786,500	20,059,000
		780,645,000		762,361,000		807,962,500		792,845,500	

† Submitted in S. Doc. 135.

‡ Eligible for selection under lump-sum appropriation for small authorized projects.

§ Eligible for selection under small navigation program not requiring specific legislation.

## Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1963

Projects (1)		Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
		Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
1. General investigations:									
	(a) Examinations and surveys	\$42,500		\$42,500		\$62,500		\$62,500	
	(b) Collection and study of basic data	82,500		82,500		82,500		82,500	
Subtotal, general investigations		125,000		125,000		145,000		145,000	
2. Construction and planning:									
	Mississippi River levees	\$2,200,000		\$2,200,000		\$3,000,000		\$2,600,000	
	Channel improvement	25,500,000		25,500,000		27,500,000		26,500,000	
	Memphis Harbor	800,000		800,000		800,000		800,000	
	Greenville Harbor	1,530,000		1,530,000		1,530,000		1,530,000	

See footnote at end of table.

## Flood control, Mississippi River and tributaries, fiscal year 1963—Continued

Projects (1)	Budget estimate for fiscal year 1963		House allowance		Senate allowance		Conference allowance	
	Construction (2)	Planning (3)	Construction (4)	Planning (5)	Construction (6)	Planning (7)	Construction (8)	Planning (9)
<b>2. Construction and planning—Continued</b>								
Old River control.....	\$4,200,000	-----	\$4,200,000	-----	\$4,174,000	-----	\$4,174,000	-----
St. Francis Basin.....	3,900,000	-----	3,900,000	-----	3,900,000	\$80,000	3,900,000	\$80,000
Lower White River.....	850,000	-----	850,000	-----	850,000	-----	850,000	-----
Cache Basin.....	-----	\$100,000	-----	\$100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000
West Tennessee tributaries.....	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----	600,000	-----
Wolf River and tributaries.....	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----	100,000	-----
Lower Arkansas.....	500,000	-----	500,000	-----	600,000	-----	550,000	-----
Texas Basin:								
Bocuf and Texas Rivers, etc.....	1,740,000	-----	1,740,000	-----	1,740,000	-----	1,740,000	-----
Red River backwater <sup>1</sup> .....	35,000	-----	35,000	-----	35,000	-----	35,000	-----
Yazoo Basin:								
Sardis Reservoir.....	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----
Enid Reservoir.....	53,000	-----	53,000	-----	53,000	-----	53,000	-----
Arkabutla Reservoir.....	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----	30,000	-----
Grenada Reservoir.....	37,000	-----	37,000	-----	37,000	-----	37,000	-----
Greenwood.....	700,000	-----	700,000	-----	700,000	-----	700,000	-----
Main stem.....	2,050,000	-----	2,050,000	-----	2,050,000	-----	2,050,000	-----
Tributaries.....	660,000	-----	660,000	-----	660,000	-----	660,000	-----
Big Sunflower River, etc.....	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----	1,200,000	-----
Yazoo backwater.....	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----	900,000	-----
Atchafalaya Basin.....	4,900,000	-----	4,900,000	-----	4,900,000	-----	4,900,000	-----
Lake Pontchartrain.....	760,000	-----	760,000	-----	760,000	-----	760,000	-----
Subtotal, construction and planning.....	53,275,000	100,000	53,275,000	100,000	56,149,000	160,000	54,699,000	160,000
Reduction for anticipated savings and slippages.....	-1,500,000	-----	-1,500,000	-----	-1,500,000	-----	-1,500,000	-----
Total, construction and planning.....	51,775,000	100,000	51,775,000	100,000	54,649,000	160,000	53,199,000	160,000
3. Maintenance.....	18,500,000	-----	18,500,000	-----	21,000,000	-----	20,000,000	-----
Grand total.....	70,500,000	-----	70,500,000	-----	75,954,000	-----	73,504,000	-----

<sup>1</sup> Completed with amount in approved budget.

## Bureau of Reclamation—Construction and rehabilitation

Project (1)	Budget estimate (2)	House allowance (3)	Senate allowance (4)	Conference allowance (5)
Advance planning.....	\$1,705,000	\$130,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,030,000
Gila project, Arizona.....	3,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
Colorado River front work and levee system, Arizona-California.....	250,000	250,000	550,000	550,000
Central Valley project, California.....	47,401,000	47,401,000	47,401,000	47,401,000
Avondale, Dalton Gardens, and Hayden Lake pipe rehabilitation, Idaho.....	519,000	519,000	519,000	519,000
Wichita project, Cheney division, Kansas.....	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000	7,100,000
Washoe project, Nevada-California.....	198,315	198,315	198,315	198,315
Rio Grande project, New Mexico.....	-----	80,000	80,000	80,000
Norman project, Oklahoma.....	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000	7,500,000
Rogue River Basin, Talent division, Oregon.....	439,000	439,000	439,000	439,000
The Dalles project, western division, Oregon.....	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000
Vale project, Bully Creek extension, Oregon.....	1,765,000	1,765,000	1,765,000	1,765,000
Klamath project, Oregon-California.....	515,000	515,000	515,000	515,000
Canadian River project, Texas.....	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, La Feria division, Texas.....	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	1,500,000
Lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Mercedes division, Texas.....	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000	1,940,000
San Angelo project, Texas.....	2,770,000	2,770,000	2,680,000	2,680,000
Weber Basin project, Utah.....	10,538,000	10,538,000	10,538,000	10,538,000
Chief Joseph Dam project, Greater Wenatchee division, Washington.....	2,136,000	2,136,000	2,136,000	2,136,000
Columbia Basin project, Washington.....	4,569,000	4,569,000	4,569,000	4,569,000
Drainage and minor construction.....	3,956,054	3,956,054	3,956,054	3,956,054
Rehabilitation and betterment of existing projects.....	5,346,000	5,346,000	5,346,000	5,346,000
Subtotal.....	114,172,369	111,597,369	113,167,369	112,797,369
Missouri River Basin project:				
Alinsworth unit, Nebraska.....	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000	5,800,000
Almena unit, Kansas.....	4,826,000	4,826,000	4,826,000	4,826,000
Cedar Bluff unit, Kansas.....	906,000	906,000	906,000	906,000
East Bench unit, Montana.....	5,620,000	5,620,000	5,620,000	5,620,000
Farwell unit, Nebraska.....	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000	6,800,000
Frenchman-Cambridge division, Nebraska.....	1,714,000	1,714,000	1,714,000	1,714,000
Glen Elder unit, Kansas.....	750,000	750,000	750,000	750,000
Oahe unit, James section, South Dakota.....	220,000	220,000	220,000	220,000
Transmission division.....	14,449,000	14,229,000	14,379,000	14,379,000
Yellowtail unit, Montana-Wyoming.....	12,150,000	12,150,000	12,150,000	12,150,000
Drainage and minor construction.....	1,795,631	1,795,631	1,820,631	1,820,631
Investigations.....	1,488,000	1,000,000	1,431,000	1,143,000
Advance planning.....	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,284,000	1,284,000
Subtotal, Missouri River Basin project.....	57,802,631	57,094,631	57,700,631	57,412,631
Other Department of the Interior agencies.....	3,240,000	2,900,000	3,008,000	3,008,000
Total, Missouri River Basin project.....	61,042,631	59,994,631	60,708,631	60,420,631
Subtotal, construction and rehabilitation.....	175,215,000	171,592,000	173,876,000	173,218,000
Undistributed reduction based on anticipated delays.....	13,515,000	18,515,000	13,515,000	15,000,000
Total, construction and rehabilitation.....	161,700,000	153,077,000	160,361,000	158,218,000

## MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1,

Public Law 87-759 the Speaker had appointed Mr. HÉBERT, Mr. COLMER, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. CHELF, Mr. BOGGS, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. SILER as members of the Battle of New Orleans

Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the bill (S. 3215) for the relief of Kim Chong Koo.



The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 10539. An act to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution fixing the time of assembly of the 88th Congress.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the following concurrent resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 584. Concurrent resolution fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress; and

H. Con. Res. 585. Concurrent resolution authorizing the officers of the House and Senate to sign enrolled bills notwithstanding the sine die adjournment.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a resolution (H. Res. 835) to appoint two Members of the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed their business of the session and are ready to adjourn.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 10539) to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide additional choice of health benefits plans, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### ASSERTION OF THE POWER OF THE SENATE TO ORIGINATE BILLS APPROPRIATING MONEY FOR THE SUPPORT OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit and send to the desk a privileged resolution, for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 414) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL was read, as follows:

Whereas the House of Representatives has adopted House Resolution 831 alleging that Senate Joint Resolution 234, a resolution continuing the appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, to be in contravention of the first clause of the seventh section of the Constitution and an infringement of the privileges of the House; and

Whereas this clause of the Constitution provides only that "All bills for raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives," and does not in anywise limit or restrict the privileges and power of the Senate with respect to any other legislation; and

Whereas the acquiescence of the Senate in permitting the House to first consider appropriation bills cannot change the clear language of the Constitution nor affect the Senate's coequal power to originate any bill not expressly "raising revenue"; and

Whereas the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, pursuant to a directive of the House of Representatives, reported to the House in 1885 that the power to originate bills appropriating money from the Treasury did not reside exclusively in the House; Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate respectfully asserts its power to originate bills appropriating money for the support of the Government and declares its willingness to submit the issue either for declaratory judgment by an appropriate appellate court of the United States or to an appropriate commission of outstanding educators specializing in the study of the English language to be chosen in equal numbers by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the House of Representatives.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the immediate consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, this resolution is just as self-explanatory, I believe, as the clause of the Constitution which is involved. I see no necessity for laboring it.

I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KEATING. Does the Senator from Georgia believe it would help to have a yea-and-nay vote on the resolution, in order to show the unanimity of the Senate in regard to it?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I am sure the Senate is unanimously in support of this proposition; and I do not think it would be worthwhile to call our associates into the Chamber, from the matters which now engage them, in order to have a yea-and-nay vote taken.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the Senator from Georgia. I merely wanted to express my strong support of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator from New York. I am sure the resolution will be unanimously agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### RESEARCH PROGRAM TO DISCOVER NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 415) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL, was read, as follows:

Whereas the vast accumulation of surplus agricultural commodities by the Government of the United States, at the expense of the American taxpayer, presents this Nation one of its most serious domestic problems involving the expenditure of billions of dollars for storage, handling and transportation alone; and

Whereas this condition makes it not only desirable but necessary that appropriate steps be taken to decrease the enormous expenditures and wastage involved in the accumulation, handling and storage of said surpluses; and

Whereas the United States has neglected adequate research in finding new means to utilize these vast surpluses for the benefit of the American people who have contributed almost \$27,000,000,000 to the farm program since 1952: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States hereby respectfully requests the Secretary of Agriculture to submit to the Director of the Budget and to the Congress in time to be considered in connection with the first supplemental appropriation bills before the Congress in the 88th Congress the most effective program available for research to discover new uses for agricultural commodities; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary be requested to limit this program to items costing not in excess of \$35,000,000 per annum above current allowances for 1963 for utilization research to discover new uses for agricultural commodities.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the resolution merely sets forth, in essence, the position of the Senate, as expressed by the 77 to 0 vote on the floor of the Senate. It requests that the Secretary of Agriculture define the program, so that the fact that it has not previously been defined and spelled out in detail could not be used as an ostensible objection to the program. The resolution does not involve the expenditure of a dime of money; it merely requests the Secretary of Agriculture to submit this program to the Congress, for its consideration.

Mr. President, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of the Senator from Georgia.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### FISCAL POLICY

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there appears in today's issue of the Washington Daily News an editorial on fiscal policy, as written by former President Harry Truman. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### "HOOEY" SAYS HARRY

Today we let Harry Truman write our editorial on fiscal policy:

"It is all a bunch of hooley to talk about cutting taxes when you are trying to give Government workers a pay raise and when we face the costly defense situation we do."

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] has asked me to request unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him be printed in the body of the Record. I so request, Mr. President.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### STATEMENT BY SENATOR JAVITS

I wish to register my strong protest against the highly arbitrary action of the other body in adamantly refusing to pass the supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 13290, because of a dispute over a few items, in another set of bills, regarding public works. The country should be made aware of the price which the other body is exacting for the willfulness of some, and the record should show clearly just where the responsibility lies.

The supplemental appropriations bill contains additional funds which are essential to the continued effectiveness of many Government agencies for the remainder of the year. I am advised that some of these agencies and their programs can get along on some sort of stretching basis until the opening of the 88th Congress next January when, we are told, another bill can be pushed through. But many agencies will be hard hit, and it is the Nation which will bear the brunt of their diminished effectiveness.

Extremely unfair is the case of the school lunch program which will be deprived of vitally needed funds for the next few school months. Similarly, Federal public welfare grants to the States under the new expanded program, especially aid for dependent chil-

dren, will be stalled, as will the new educational television program and the U.S. Information Agency; perhaps most cruelly, the recently passed and much needed increase in annuities to civil service retirees will be held up along with many items for salaries of employees of several departments and agencies.

We should not ask these agencies and these employees to scrape along on a basis of expediency at a time when the Nation demands so much of them. I believe the other body is bypassing its responsibilities shamefully and the Nation should know it. It is small consolation at this late date, but at least the Congress must now reaffirm its solemn obligation to pay those sums at the earliest opportunity in the next Congress.

# BUDGET ESTIMATES AND AMOUNTS OF ALL APPROPRIATIONS BILLS, 87TH CONGRESS, 2D SESSION

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Record a table which shows the budget estimates, the amounts in the House and the Senate versions of the bills, and the final amounts agreed to in conference for every appropriation bill approved during the 87th Congress, 2d session.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table of appropriation bills, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[Does not include any back-door appropriation bills. Also excludes permanent appropriations]

Bill No.	Title	Budget estimates to House	Amount as passed House	Budget estimates to Senate	Amount as passed Senate	Final action: Amount as approved	Increase or decrease compared to budget estimates to Senate
<b>1962 SUPPLEMENTALS</b>							
H.J. Res. 612	Veterans' Administration.....	\$151,200,000	\$55,000,000	\$151,200,000	\$55,000,000	\$55,000,000	—\$96,200,000
H.R. 11038	2d supplemental.....	1,503,265,000	447,514,000	1,522,231,929	560,008,344	373,550,689	—1,148,681,240
H.J. Res. 745	Supplemental <sup>1</sup> .....		(133,259,929)		(277,222,429)		
	Total, 1962 supplementals.....	654,465,000	502,514,000	673,431,929	615,008,344	428,550,689	—244,881,240
<b>1963 APPROPRIATIONS</b>							
H.R. 10526	Treasury-Post Office.....	5,575,386,000	5,461,671,000	5,575,386,000	5,526,558,000	5,489,781,000	—85,605,000
H.R. 10802	Interior.....	930,674,000	808,595,000	932,674,000	922,560,820	885,362,000	—47,312,000
H.R. 10904	Labor-HEW.....	5,284,831,000	5,170,788,000	5,386,363,100	5,380,958,000	5,334,609,500	—51,753,600
H.R. 11151	Legislative.....	114,078,425	113,733,890	146,913,210	146,690,690	146,477,270	—435,940
H.R. 11289	Defense.....	47,907,000,000	47,839,491,000	47,907,000,000	48,429,221,000	48,136,247,000	+229,247,000
H.R. 12276	District of Columbia.....	(299,134,478)	(290,059,000)	(300,161,478)	(289,253,300)	(288,986,350)	(—11,175,128)
	Federal payment.....	35,199,000	33,199,000	35,199,000	33,199,000	33,199,000	—2,000,000
	Loan authorizations.....	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	(26,042,000)	
H.R. 12580	State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary.....	2,004,178,000	1,901,215,700	2,123,248,000	2,036,908,700	2,025,895,700	—97,352,300
H.R. 12648	Agriculture.....	6,354,783,000	5,476,842,500	6,354,783,000	4,774,983,000	5,487,029,500	—867,753,500
	Loan authorizations.....	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(805,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(820,000,000)	(+15,000,000)
H.R. 12711	Independent offices.....	12,590,063,500	11,801,141,000	12,580,269,500	11,801,590,000	11,631,792,100	—948,477,400
H.R. 12870	Military construction.....	1,594,729,500	1,369,741,000	1,594,729,500	1,350,501,000	1,319,114,500	—275,615,000
H.R. 12900	Public works.....	4,745,332,000	4,613,807,900	5,651,751,000	5,211,271,400	5,069,134,400	—582,616,600
H.R. 13175	Foreign assistance.....	7,335,029,000	5,956,852,000	7,335,029,000	6,781,402,000	6,278,962,000	—1,056,067,000
H.R. 13290	Supplemental.....	543,728,980	404,747,880	631,785,376	550,608,376		—631,785,376
	Total, 1963 appropriations.....	94,985,012,405	90,710,825,870	96,255,130,686	92,946,411,986	91,837,603,970	—4,417,526,716
	Total, all appropriations.....	95,639,477,405	91,213,339,870	96,928,562,615	93,561,420,330	92,266,154,659	—4,662,407,956
	Total, loan authorizations.....	(831,042,000)	(831,042,000)	(831,042,000)	(846,042,000)	(846,042,000)	(+15,000,000)

<sup>1</sup> Adjusted to reflect rescission of \$44,637,000 for Civil Service Commission proposed in H. Doc. No. 333 but not acted upon by Congress.

<sup>2</sup> Of this amount, \$117,457,000 which was originally provided for fiscal year 1962 costs eliminated by H. Con. Res. 505 as no longer required.

<sup>3</sup> Included primarily deficiency items contained in 2d supplemental, 1962 (H.R. 11038) considered necessary to enable certain agencies to finish out fiscal year. Not sent to conference or enacted into law.

<sup>4</sup> Includes borrowing authority as follows: Budget estimate, \$20,000,000; House reported and passed, \$6,000,000; Senate reported and passed, \$20,000,000.

<sup>5</sup> Consists largely of Senate items not included in estimates to House.

<sup>6</sup> Includes \$514,500,000 in new obligatory authority in lieu of utilizing the sum of

\$514,500,000 appropriated for the current year for the procurement of long-range bombers, as proposed in the President's budget.

<sup>7</sup> Includes comparability adjustment of \$115,480,000 for borrowing authority replaced by appropriation.

<sup>8</sup> Includes comparability adjustments of \$34,427,500 for contract authorization and borrowing authority replaced by appropriations.

<sup>9</sup> In addition, permanent appropriations (interest on the debt is by far the largest item) recurring under basic law, and therefore not requiring annual action by Congress, were tentatively estimated, for fiscal year 1963, at \$9,996,000,000 in the January budget. Precise amount is subject to some revision—perhaps slightly upward.

NOTE.—Indefinite appropriations in the bills are included in this table.

## NOTIFICATION OF PRESIDENT RELATING TO ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I submit a resolution which I send to the desk, and for which I request immediate consideration.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 416) submitted by Mr. MANSFIELD was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Presiding Officer to join a similar committee of the House of Representatives to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses have completed the business of the session and are ready to adjourn unless he has some further communication to make to them.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senate will

proceed to consider the resolution; and, without objection, it is agreed to.

The Chair appoints the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] the members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

## RECESS

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

At 3 o'clock and 34 minutes p.m., the Senate reconvened, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. MORSE in the chair).

## NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, from the committee appointed to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses are ready to adjourn unless he had further communications to make to us, I report that the committee has performed its duty, having previously communicated with the President, and that the President informs us that he has no further communications to make to the Congress.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Perhaps it would not be amiss to repeat his words, that if it were all right by us, it was all right by him.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.



Mr. President, there are three resolutions at the desk. I ask that they be called up and considered.

#### DATE OF ASSEMBLY OF 88TH CONGRESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 907) fixing the time of the assembly of the 88th Congress, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Eighty-eighth Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.*

#### SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 584), fixing the date for the sine die adjournment of the 2d session of the 87th Congress, which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress shall adjourn on Saturday, October 13, 1962, and that when they adjourn on said day, they stand adjourned sine die.*

#### AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 585), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That notwithstanding the sine die adjournment of the two Houses, the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate be, and they are hereby, authorized to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions duly passed by the two Houses and found truly enrolled.*

#### EXPRESSION OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 417), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.*

#### EXPRESSION OF THANKS OF THE SENATE TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 418), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate, for the courteous, dignified, and impartial manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the second session of the Eighty-seventh Congress.*

#### APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT SUBSEQUENT TO SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD submitted a resolution (S. Res. 419), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved, That notwithstanding the final adjournment of the present session of the Congress, the President of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized to make appointments to commissions or committees authorized by law, by concurrent action of the two Houses, or by order of the Senate.*

#### STATEMENT OF APPRECIATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it would be hard to imagine a more ingratiating Senator, or a more accommodating one, than the distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. Our relationship has been a source of strength to me. We have dealt with each other almost daily since January 20, 1961, working out the schedule of the Senate, and attempting to mold a legislative program that would be worthy of the greatest parliamentary body in the world. Where there appeared to be almost insuperable obstacles to that program, the Senator from Illinois threw his immense powers of persuasion into the resolution of those obstacles. I do not mean to say he gave up his beliefs or his colorful partisanship; he did not. But he has prevented partisanship from itself becoming an insuperable obstacle to the performance of our legislative responsibilities. For that I honor him, and I pay him these respects as a friend and admirer. Whatever our profound disagreements on many policy matters, we have not permitted these to disrupt our steady friendship.

The very agreeable minority whip, the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], has carried many responsibilities, both dramatic and dreary. He has been a steadfast floor leader of his party in the absence of the Senator from Illinois, and a wise counselor at all times. No more likable man exists in the Congress.

I find it hard to improve on the words of the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], when he spoke of the distinguished majority whip, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] last Tuesday:

I challenge anyone to be associated with this wonderful man for any length of time and not increase greatly his admiration and affection for him.

HUBERT HUMPHREY and I were friends before we assumed duties of leadership in this Chamber. I can honestly state that this friendship has been absolutely invaluable to me during the 87th Congress. A servant of the State of Minnesota, of the Democratic Party, and of the highest progressive traditions of American political life, Senator HUMPHREY has earned the lasting gratitude of all those who have worked with him in the U.S. Senate.

The tribute paid the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY] by the distinguished junior Senator from Florida

[Mr. SMATHERS] might appropriately be made about its author. Senator SMATHERS has been an independent, hard-working, and highly productive member of the Senate Democratic leadership. Easygoing as he seems, he has been unstinting in his service to the Senate, and by that service has earned the respect, as well as the fond regard, of his colleagues.

Mr. President, I pay my additional respects to the committee staffs, who have labored through an unusually long and productive Congress, and whose efforts are completely essential to any sound record of accomplishment in the Senate; to the staff of the Senate itself, especially to our beloved friend, Secretary Felton Johnston, now recovering from an eye operation and soon to return to his post in good health; to Joe Duke, our unfailingly helpful Sergeant at Arms; to Bobby Baker, for many years the indispensable right arm of Senate leadership; to Mark Trice, Bill Brownrigg, and Rein Vander Zee, who have, with efficiency and with agreeable spirits, kept the machinery of the Senate running; to the clerks at the desk, the official reporters, the young men who serve in the cloakrooms and as pages and those who serve both press and Senate—I shall not detain the Senate with a complete listing of those without whom we could not operate this huge institution. It must suffice that I offer the thanks of the elected Members of this body to the unelected members.

Let me pay a last overdue debt of thanks to Senators LEE METCALF, JOE HICKEY, CLAIBORNE PELL, QUENTIN BURDICK, and MAURINE NEUBERGER. These freshmen Senators served the Senate in one of the most grueling tasks it befalls a Senator to perform—presiding over the long, long sessions we frequently endure. They did it without complaint, and with courtesy, dignity, and authority.

Mr. President, I would be remiss in my obligation if I did not mention the cooperation, understanding and tolerance shown by the leadership of the other body in the person of the Speaker, Mr. MCCORMACK, the majority leader, Mr. ALBERT, of Oklahoma; the majority whip, Mr. BOGGS, of Louisiana; the minority leader, Mr. HALLECK, of Indiana; and the minority whip, Mr. ARENDS, of Illinois. They were very cooperative. Collectively they have performed a great service in the House of Representatives. I commend and congratulate them for what they have been able to do over the past 2 years.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the minority whip, the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and all the Republican Senators, I thank the majority leader for the very thoughtful, considerate, patient, and understanding manner in which he has led the Senate through this long and difficult session.

As he has said, he has had the cooperation and understanding of the minority leader [Mr. DIRKSEN]. When he congratulates Mr. DIRKSEN, he congratulates all the members of the Republican Party in the Senate, who have followed Mr. DIRKSEN and who have great respect for his leadership. We thank the majority leader for his work in conducting this long and arduous session, in which we have all worked hard, but in which he has worked harder than any of us.

As acting minority leader today, I pay this tribute to him in the closing hour of the session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his kind words. I assure him that I deeply appreciate them.

#### ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, it is with regret and resignation and relief that I move that the Senate stand adjourned sine die.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORSE in the chair). It is with great pleasure that the Chair puts the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), Saturday, October 13, 1962, pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 584, the Senate adjourned sine die.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 585, agreed to October 13, 1962, the President pro tempore, on October 16, 1962, signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, which had previously been signed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes;

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7932. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1948, so as to repeal portions thereof relating to residual rights in certain land on Santa Rosa Island, Fla.;

H.R. 10620. An act to amend section 213 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the maximum limitations on the amount allowable as a deduction for medical, dental, etc., expenses, and for other purposes;

H.R. 11586. An act to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12276. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12580. An act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, the judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12648. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12820. An act to validate the coverage of certain State and local employees in the State of Arkansas, under the agreement entered into by such State pursuant to section 218 of the Social Security Act, and for other purposes;

H.R. 12900. An act making appropriations for certain civil functions administered by the Department of Defense, certain agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Atomic Energy Commission, the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and certain river basin commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1963, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13273. An act authorizing the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors for navigation, flood control, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes;

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution to provide protection for the golden eagle; and

H.J. Res. 907. Joint resolution that the 88th Congress shall assemble at noon on Wednesday, January 9, 1963.

#### ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The Secretary of the Senate, on October 17, 1962, presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 1961. An act for the relief of Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes;

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to

adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

#### APPROVAL OF SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS AFTER SINE DIE ADJOURNMENT

The President of the United States, subsequent to sine die adjournment of the Senate, notified the Secretary of the Senate that on the following dates he had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On October 9, 1962:

S. 455. An act to amend the act of July 14, 1955, relating to air pollution control, to authorize appropriations for an additional 2-year period, and for other purposes;

S. 1060. An act to authorize the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Oroville-Tonasket unit of the Okanogan-Similkameen division, Chief Joseph Dam project, Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 3120. An act to amend section 6 of the act of May 29, 1884;

S. 3156. An act to amend section 142 of title 28, United States Code, with regard to furnishing court quarters and accommodations at places where regular terms of court are authorized to be held, and for other purposes;

S. 3408. An act to establish in the Library of Congress a library of musical scores and other instructional materials to further educational, vocational, and cultural opportunities in the field of music for blind persons;

S. 3431. An act to consent to the amendment of the Pacific Marine Fisheries Compact and to the participation of certain additional States in such compact in accordance with the terms of such amendment;

S.J. Res. 60. Joint resolution to establish the sesquicentennial commission for the celebration of the Battle of New Orleans, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire certain property within Chalmette National Historical Park, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 211. Joint resolution providing for the establishment of an annual National School Lunch Week; and

S.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution authorizing the issuance of a gold medal to General of the Army Douglas MacArthur.

On October 10, 1962:

S. 136. An act for the relief of Dinko Doric;

S. 453. An act for the relief of Robert J. Scanlan;

S. 689. An act for the relief of Karl Heinz Agar;

S. 1552. An act to protect the public health by amending the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to assure the safety, effectiveness, and reliability of drugs, authorize standardization of drug names, and clarify and strengthen existing inspection authority, and for other purposes;

S. 1999. An act for the relief of Anna Marie Erdelyi;

S. 2667. An act for the relief of Sabastiana Santoro;

S. 2777. An act for the relief of Arild Erickson Sandli;

S. 2836. An act for the relief of Carmelo Rafala;

S. 2902. An act for the relief of Sumiko Takahashi;

S. 2922. An act for the relief of Raymond Chester Hendon;



S. 3089. An act to amend the act directing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain public lands in the State of Nevada to the Colorado River Commission of Nevada in order to extend for 5 years the time for selecting such lands;

S. 3275. An act for the relief of Anna Sciamanna Misticoni;

S. 3295. An act for the relief of Mathew Lengyel (also known as Brother Paul, S.V.D.);

S. 3336. An act for the relief of Lazaro Loyola Arinque, Jr.; and

S. 3396. An act to amend section 511(h) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, in order to extend the time for commitment of construction reserve funds.

On October 11, 1962:

S. 1651. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to delegate the function of approving contracts not exceeding \$50,000;

S. 2690. An act for the relief of Mona McIsaac Downey;

S. 2711. An act for the relief of Tasla Demetropoulou (Dimitropoulos);

S. 2908. An act for the relief of Rosa Fumarola Balice;

S. 2992. An act for the relief of Michelangelo Comito (Nati);

S. 3152. An act to provide for the nutritional enrichment and sanitary packaging of rice prior to its distribution under certain Federal programs, including the national school lunch program;

S. 3240. An act for the relief of Mrs. Lee Ma Chin-Ying;

S. 3279. An act for the relief of Yet Gee Moy (Tsze Woo Lai) and Mee Sen Moy (Sau Ming Lai);

S. 3452. An act for the relief of Dr. Hassan M. Nouri; and

S. 3600. An act for the relief of Chao Hua-Hsin.

On October 15, 1962:

S. 320. An act to amend the provisions contained in part II of the Interstate Commerce Act concerning registration of State certificates whereby a common carrier by motor vehicles may engage in interstate and foreign commerce within a State;

S. 507. An act to set aside certain lands in Washington for Indians of the Quinault Tribe;

S. 914. An act to provide for more effective administration of public assistance in the District of Columbia, to make certain relatives responsible for support of needy persons, and for other purposes;

S. 962. An act to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, to aid the Civil Aeronautics Board in the investigation of aircraft accidents, and for other purposes;

S. 1263. An act for the relief of Marie Margaret Arvanetes;

S. 1288. An act to amend section 362(b) of the Communications Act of 1934;

S. 2454. An act to amend the Housing Amendments of 1955 to make Indian tribes eligible for Federal loans to finance public works or facilities, and for other purposes;

S. 2568. An act to amend the act of September 7, 1950, to extend the regulatory authority of the Federal and State agencies concerned under the terms of the Convention for the Establishment of an Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, signed at Washington May 31, 1949, and for other purposes;

S. 2687. An act for the relief of Robert D. Barbee;

S. 2697. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide an extension of the period within which certain educational programs must be begun and completed in the case of persons called to active duty during the Berlin crisis, and for other purposes;

S. 2753. An act for the relief of Duk Man Lee and Soon Mal Lee;

S. 2928. An act for the relief of Seymour K. Owens;

S. 2950. An act for the relief of Dwijendra Kumar Misra;

S. 2953. An act relating to the tax-exempt status of the pension plan of Local Union No. 435 of the International Hod Carriers' Building and Common Laborers' Union of America;

S. 3085. An act for the relief of Paul Huygelen and Luba A. Huygelen;

S. 3177. An act for the relief of Michael (Mike) Bessler;

S. 3265. An act for the relief of Despina Anastos (Psychopeda);

S. 3267. An act for the relief of Gunter Heinz Hillebrand;

S. 3338. An act to incorporate the American Symphony Orchestra League;

S. 3390. An act for the relief of Naife Kahl;

S. 3504. An act to amend the Migratory Bird Conservation Act;

S. 3557. An act for the relief of Betty Sandra Pagann;

S. 3631. An act to amend title 13, United States Code, to preserve the confidential nature of copies of reports filed with the Bureau of the Census on a confidential basis;

S.J. Res. 214. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States to designate the period from November 26, 1962, through December 2, 1962, as National Cultural Center Week; and

S.J. Res. 235. Joint resolution to extend the time during which loans for mass transportation facilities may be made under title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955.

On October 16, 1962:

S. 2795. An act to prohibit the use by collecting agencies and private detective agencies of any name, emblem, or insignia which reasonably tends to convey the impression that any such agency is an agency of the government of the District of Columbia.

On October 18, 1962:

S. 1563. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain lands within the Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C., to the Georgia-Carolina Council, Inc., Boy Scouts of America, for recreation and camping purposes;

S. 1658. An act to amend the act of January 2, 1951, prohibiting the transportation of gambling devices in interstate and foreign commerce;

S. 2450. An act for the relief of Major C. Todd, Jr., and the estate of Ira T. Todd, Sr.;

S. 3451. An act for the relief of G. W. Todd and the estate of Lloyd Parks;

S. 3389. An act to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, to develop American-flag carriers and promote the foreign commerce of the United States through the use of mobile trade fairs;

S. 3394. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. William A. Carter, U.S. Air Force; and

S. 3679. An act authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations to hold a World Food Congress in the United States in 1963.

On October 23, 1962:

S. 1961. An act for the relief of 1st Lt. Charles M. Cox, U.S. Army (retired);

S. 2555. An act for the relief of Fong Yee Hin;

S. 3124. An act for the relief of Lt. Col. Gustave M. Minton, Jr., U.S. Air Force;

S. 3215. An act for the relief of Kim Chong Koo;

S. 3451. An act to provide relief for residential occupants of unpatented mining claims upon which valuable improvements have been placed, and for other purposes; and

S. 3453. An act for the relief of Dr. Felix Nabor Sabates.

On October 24, 1962:

S. 1447. An act to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955, as

amended, and to provide for the adjustment of annuities paid from the District of Columbia teachers' retirement and annuity fund;

S. 3361. An act to facilitate the entry of alien skilled specialists and certain relatives of U.S. citizens, and for other purposes;

S. 3705. An act to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958, as amended, to increase salaries, to adjust pay alignment, and for other purposes; and

S.J. Res. 208. Joint resolution to establish a Commission to develop and execute plans for the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the Battle of Lake Erie, and for other purposes.

## OCEANOGRAPHY PROGRAM— POCKET VETO

The President of the United States notified the Secretary of the Senate that he had allowed the bill (S. 901) to provide for a comprehensive, long-range, and coordinated national program in oceanography, and for other purposes, to expire at midnight of October 17, 1962, without his approval.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 13, 1962

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Ephesians 4: 3: Endeavor to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace.*

God of infinite grace and goodness, from whom cometh our help and our hope, Thou knowest how weak we are in faith and how hesitatingly we often enter upon a new day.

Gird us with a capacity to see all our tasks in their right perspective and with courage to discharge them faithfully and without fear.

Grant that when we leave this Chamber we may commend and commit one another to Thy love and care, beseeching Thee that the benediction of Thy praise and peace may rest upon our President, our Speaker, our chosen Representatives, and all who, in this 87th Congress, have had the sacred privilege of serving our beloved country.

*May the Lord bless us and keep us; may the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; may the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.*

Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## CIVIL FUNCTIONS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1963

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

There was no objection.